

THE  
LONDON QUARTERLY  
REVIEW.

---

OCTOBER, 1883.

---

ART. I.—THE LONDON QUARTERLY REVIEW :  
NEW SERIES.

THE LONDON QUARTERLY REVIEW enters with the present Number on a New Series; and it will not be thought inappropriate that a few pages should be devoted to an explanation of the change, in its reference as well to the past as to the future. These introductory pages will partake, more or less, of a confidential character; in fact, the Journal, which generally keeps its personality out of sight, will for a little while, and for once only, make itself the subject, and that without needless reserve.

At the outset, it must be understood that this new commencement does not mean a new probation. We—it is impossible not to glide into the editorial WE—have no failure to confess or to retrieve. Our character is established; and we are not by any means coming before the public as suppliants for a return of forfeited confidence. Yet our programme does undoubtedly aim at the excitement of a wider and deeper interest in the success of the Journal, and makes promises which certainly have the appearance of bidding for more extended popularity. Its articles will be as a rule briefer and more universally acceptable; will embrace a larger variety of topics, and be written with a more studied adaptation to that undefinable something which is called the public taste. Nor will it be thought a trivial matter that we shall henceforward lay a

[No. CXXI.]—NEW SERIES, VOL. I. No. I.

B

lighter financial tax on our constituents: that end, however, being attained without any marked change in the general form and characteristics of the periodical. But, what is of more importance than this, it is confidently assumed that the editorial staff will, as it is now constituted, be received by the public with approval. Two names are now linked again, after a term of severance, which were formerly and for some years joined in the service of this REVIEW; joined honestly, faithfully, in all essential matters cordially and entirely, and not without success. All will accept their union as a guarantee that nothing will be admitted to which the general body of their special supporters might take exception; and if their constituency are content with them, they are perfectly content and more than content with each other.

All this is very confidential. Pursuing the same strain, we may add that the editorial functions are not of such a nature as to divert the attention of those who discharge them from their more proper business, or to sequester any portion of time which is consecrated to one high ministry. They have abundant helpers in the more secular part of their duties; and know well the secret of subdivided labour. Their special contributions to the work are always in the line of their own ministerial province in the Christian Church; sometimes directly, sometimes indirectly, but always really, subservient to it. And, for the rest, they hold that the conduct of a periodical which is devoted to the highest interests of Christianity, aims to promote every branch of sound Christian labour, and to aid the judgments of general readers in discriminating between the good and the evil of the ever-increasing literature of the day, is an occupation that needs no apology. Such an employment of time has had the unanimous verdict of Christian ages in its favour.

But this leads at once to what will be naturally expected in these pages: a calm assertion of the service which has for many years been rendered by this organ in its old form. During the last thirty years—embracing an entire generation—it has been faithful in defending Christian truth and encouraging Christian work; and has maintained a tone which has never once varied from the keynote struck at the beginning. The LONDON QUARTERLY has never taught a heresy; nor has it winked at any

known tendency to error. No heresiarch or fashionable teacher of theological novelty has passed without reproof. No exponent of philosophical or ethical error of any moment has escaped notice. Few of the great questions of that period have failed to receive, more or less, thorough examination. And, with all this, the Journal has furnished a series of theological, exegetical and philosophical essays which have had their not unfruitful influence in moulding the judgments of young ministers especially. Taken as a whole, it may be safely affirmed that the REVIEW has been a power for good, the value of which it would be easier to disparage than to exaggerate.

On the other hand, it may have had its defects. The scantiness of its resources has not allowed it to compete successfully with some other periodicals in general literature and science. Often it has either failed to take up, or has taken up rather late, subjects of vivid though passing interest. Sometimes it has committed the unpardonable offence of being respectable and dull. Once or twice it has admitted questionable discussions, or essays that would have been more in keeping elsewhere. Occasionally it has staked its value for the quarter on one or two articles. There can be no doubt that many of the complaints freely urged against it have had good ground. But all these faults or flaws have been comparatively slight when weighed against the merit of its calm, consistent, trustworthy vindication of Christian principle: a fidelity to the truth that might always be surely counted on. In proof of this there lies the goodly series of our issues. They speak for themselves; no one who has had to do in any way with their publication need feel any shame in taking down any one of them.

That series, as such, is now ended. We have to abdicate our place among the six-shilling quarterlies. After resisting this necessity long, and pleading earnestly in deprecation of it, we have had to yield to the tendency of the times, which is against that respectable old brotherhood. We have had also to yield to the force of argument based on calculation, which convinces us that our proper function will be better discharged, because it will be discharged in a wider sphere, by the change that the present Number inaugurates. After all, the Journal is for its readers; and their benefit must be the main consideration.

We expect to address three times the number ; and to influence a circle of three times the circumference. This is a temptation irresistible ; and has swayed the minds of many whose tastes have submitted to the sacrifice. For it must not be supposed that the change has been made without reluctance. Some who have known the REVIEW from its inception, or during the greater part of its career, would have been glad to see it honourably end, while a younger and lighter-hearted successor, of an altogether different type, took its place. But wise counsellors suggested a compromise : such a compromise as now lies before the reader.

One strong argument that swayed the determination of the question was the blank prospect of the possibility that such an organ and such a power as this might cease. Any break in the continuity would have been attended with this danger. It is exceedingly hard to establish a new periodical of this type. With a new name, and new array, and new pretensions, it is more than probable that our old Journal would have withered. That danger is, it may be hoped, happily averted. We have taken a bold step ; and have little doubt that, if we are enabled to go on in the style of our present new beginning, we shall realize our most sanguine expectations. There is everything so far to encourage : "so far," we must repeat ; for much depends still on the estimate formed of our undertaking by many whose response to it is yet waited for. We have a large number of friends at home and abroad to whom nothing needs to be said : they have generously and persistently sustained the REVIEW through good and through evil report, in its brighter and in its darker days ; and their help may be relied on still. But there is perhaps a still larger number whom these lines may directly or circuitously reach, whose suffrages would make the difference between a scanty and an abundant success. To them mainly our observations will be addressed.

And it may as well be avowed at once that we address them first of all and mainly as belonging to the Methodist public. Though our REVIEW has never been an avowed organ of Methodism, it cannot be disguised that it approaches as nearly to that character as is consistent with independence of direct

responsibility to the Connexional authorities and the absence of direct Connexional control. As matter of fact, it has long been regarded on both sides of the Atlantic, and indeed in other regions beyond, as the Methodist Quarterly without the name. It is of no use to disavow this; nor is there any need to shrink from it. There is hardly a religious community in Christendom which is without a similar organ; and in such an organ the various shades of opinion in many Churches find their expression. As to the abstract question of the general utility or propriety of such representative organs there may be a variety of judgments. Some would sweep away this kind of literature from the service of the Churches altogether; they would abolish all papers, all periodicals, and all media of public discussion, by one general decree. But it is useless and needless to discuss this question. All these kinds of literature are established, and so firmly established that nothing can shake their position. The wisest course is to make the best of the institution, and to use the press "as not abusing it" to the very utmost. And certainly very much may be said as to the practical utility of that sort of literature for which we are now pleading. The religious newspaper must fight its own battle. The religious magazine, professedly such, finds it easier of course to maintain its claims. But the distinctly Christian review—the review, that is, which surveys the whole field of things thought, things written, and things done, from a religious point of view—can defend itself. It would be hard to over-estimate its importance—where it has been wisely and healthily conducted—in diffusing sound principles and setting important questions in their just light before the public. But, after all, its chief value is seen in the counteraction of the evil influence of periodicals not healthily conducted. There are a few quarterly serials which have for many years done very much to undermine the foundations of Christianity in a multitude of minds. And no one can tell how much good has been effected by those faithful rivals which have followed their steps with the antidote, or preceded them by the salutary prophylactic.

The intelligent Methodist public ought not to allow their old Quarterly Review to languish. They surely should not suffer its continuing in existence to be a doubtful matter. They are

showing a wise appreciation of their other more directly or more indirectly Connexional organs, which, according to statistical accounts, are steadily advancing in favour. The old *Methodist Magazine*, in particular, seems to be not only keeping its ground, but renewing its youth. The life and vigour infused into it of late have awakened a general response. And we have little doubt that our REVIEW will assert its claims, and meet with a patronage it has not known before. It will be judged, not exactly by its own absolute merits in the competition with others, but by its importance in the economy of the religious community. In plain words, it will be sustained by many who will not too carefully consider whether other similar periodicals are not on the whole more able and better worth the expense; but who will feel it as it were a point of honour not to let this old representative of Methodist judgment on public questions become extinct, while other bodies of Christians are taking good care of their representatives.

Here the question arises whether or not the REVIEW should have been started afresh on a more specifically theological basis. This question was well considered; and, taking all things into account, it was judged advisable to retain its old character. A Journal devoted exclusively to theology would encounter very severe difficulties, and exist, if it existed at all, under very hard conditions. These scarcely need to be enumerated; they are obvious at a first glance. Suffice that they are so formidable as to be conclusive against such a project. A theological Review worthy of the name would aim to be an arbiter on an infinite variety of the most important problems, and must undertake the settlement of the most perplexing and vexed questions that agitate the human mind. Its range would be exceedingly wide, embracing a vast encyclopædia of subjects connected with the criticism and exposition of Scripture, the dogmas and controversies of theology, and all the shades and subtle evolutions of error. The conduct of such a periodical would overtax any energies that it might command in its service; and must needs fail at many points. The more it succeeded, or rather approximated to success, the more limited would be its circle of readers; and that is itself a fatal consideration. There are a few instances of comparative prosperity

in undertakings of this kind ; but they are very few, and their victory over difficulty only very comparative. That such a Review might be so conducted as to be of eminent service to the Christian cause there can be no doubt ; nor can it be doubted that we ourselves could secure the assistance of a staff of workers amply provided with the requisites for an achievement of this kind. But the day has not come for the practical realization of any such ideal, and it does not enter into our present plans.

All this, however, does not imply that theology will cease to occupy a commanding place in our pages. The fact is, that in the present day no periodical of a general kind,—that is, not devoted to some specific branch of art or science,—can ignore theology or questions theological in their bearings. In the very nature of things such questions are supreme : they cannot be hid, and will assert themselves. They give their interest, for good or evil, to the pages of every periodical, even the most popular. We have only to glance over the contents of all our quarterlies, monthlies, and weeklies, to find evidences of this. That would be counted a poor number of any one of them which should not contain some article or articles piquing curiosity on some subject connected with the Christian faith and the religious aspirations and hopes of man. Whether they will or not, our popular writers on science, philosophy, history, and art, must pay their homage to the irrepressible claims of the religious instinct. Theology, which gives its highest name to the subject with which that instinct deals, is imperative, and will be obeyed. Nothing is more marked, nothing more beautiful, nothing more triumphant, than its sway in all fields of thought. What is it that gives the chief interest to modern discussions on physical laws, on evolution, on social science, but their close alliance, for good or evil, with the doctrines which Divine Revelation teaches ? Certainly, therefore, theology will in our pages have the same position of dignity which it has always had : no more and no less.

The kind of theology—it must be distinctly understood—will be the same. There is a notion very prevalent in the present day that the time has come for a freer handling of the truths of religion and of the inspiration of the volume

which is the teacher and the standard of those truths. There are very many, and perhaps some of them read these lines, who share largely the current spirit of restless impatience with the fixed formulæ and formularies of Christianity. They would feel it to be a great relief if they were promised a relaxation of a few dogmas which have long restrained their habits of speculation. It would be more than a consolation to them to think that certain questions as to the origin of man, and, at the other pole of his history, his everlasting destinies, were thrown open. They would breathe more freely if the fetters were removed from these subjects and many others connected with them. Those fetters are removed, or at any rate rendered far less galling, in most of the periodicals of the day; and there can be no doubt that ours would be much more acceptable if it followed in the general drift, and assumed a freer, less dogmatic, more eclectic, and, in the strict sense of the word, sceptical tone. But it may be as well at the outset to preclude any such hope. The old truths which were once for all delivered, and which have borne the test of ages, will not be any of them renounced or held less waveringly than of old. And that, not only because our lines have been laid down for us from the beginning, and we dare not discredit ancient pledges, and are afraid to abandon an orthodoxy which is necessary to our own well-being; but because we are profoundly convinced that the free spirit of the age is licentiousness under the guise of freedom. Our pages will contain no surrender, no traces of a tendency or temptation to surrender, any article which the evangelical Church of Christ holds dear.

But this we may promise: that every one of the questions which float before our own and our readers' minds while this subject is now before us, shall have, according to our skill, a careful and sympathizing, and, in a certain sense, dispassionate consideration. Earnestly as we maintain the canonical authority of Scripture, and the integrity of its great system of truth, we are keenly sensitive to the necessity of defending both with an intelligent appreciation of the grounds of their adversaries' opposition. A blind orthodoxy, which spurns the thought of apology, brands examination as impious, and knows no mercy for the honest doubts of the doubter, has no part

in us and we have no part in it. The hesitations and scruples of those to whom many of the doctrines of Christianity are a burden will meet with nothing but sympathy. The difficulties of the Bible, the reconciliation of reason and faith, the adjustments of the boundaries of science and religion, the lines which faintly but surely divide truth from error or orthodoxy from heresy, will be temperately and tenderly dealt with. And those who have gone far, too far, with the spirit of destructiveness or the dissolution of dogmatic tests, will find, as we hope, that the arguments which have led them astray are examined respectfully and with care. We dare not add, with success : that is more than can be pledged. On some of the gravest questions of theological truth the light shines clearly and steadily : they can be defended with supreme confidence, for they defend themselves to the sincere inquirer. But there are some which enter deeply into our probation through their very difficulties. The cross of Jesus is a theological as well as an ethical cross. The fulness, or full assurance, of understanding is pledged only to one central truth, "God and His Christ;" and they are wise who accept the conditions of the mental probation of Christianity. All that our REVIEW, in common with similar defenders of the faith, can do is to examine honestly the arguments brought forward, and point out, as can almost in every case be successfully done, that they are not sufficient to unsettle the great and long-tried foundations.

We have always had, and hope still to have, a large constituency of readers among the rising ministry ; and that particular ministry which is pledged to the standards of Methodism. It is not of them that we predicate a disposition to desire freer interpretations of religious doctrine ; to suppose in them such a desire would be to impeach their sincerity in adhering to their community : which be far from us. Whether as candidates, probationers, or ordained ministers, they assent to, and, as it were subscribe, a very definite series of doctrinal definitions : not the less definite because they are not formulated in a body of articles. Standards of faith may be as binding as articles ; in some cases, and to some minds, more binding. At any rate, that they are binding is evidenced year after year by the fact that on this doctrine and on that some

are occasionally found wanting, and are obliged by their convictions to retire. There is no doubt that questions are now agitating many minds on which they must make their decision. And with regard to them we hope to be found of some use. They need not to be mentioned at present: not that there would be any difficulty in mentioning them; but because their time will come, as it has already come in our past pages. No pains will be spared to commend ourselves to their judgment, as being those of our readers who will be nearest to our hearts. And this reminds us of other classes of labourers in the service of the community, who are constantly teaching the old and the young, though not as ordained pastors and teachers. It is currently reported—but we believe with great exaggeration—that many of these are admitting into their minds the beginnings of error as to some most important truths: such, for instance, as the everlasting existence of the human soul, either in heaven with God or separated from Him. It is hard to believe that men pledged to one standard of doctrine should teach according to another; and equally hard to believe that congregations of hearers, in some sense similarly pledged, should suffer it to be so. Be that as it may, we know that among those classes of unordained agents we have hitherto had welcome access; and to them also we hope to be serviceable in the time to come.

With regard to all these ministers of the Word—whether in one community or in another—it may be said that their best safeguard against error, and their best confirmation in the truth, is their thorough understanding of the Scripture. There is no form of vital error which may not be pierced through and through by a clear exhibition of the meaning of God's Word. The hopeless heretic is he who turns away from the Rule of Faith. It is hardly possible to recover or preserve him. We are now, however, thinking only of those who accept the Scriptures. And for their sake we hope to give, as of old, from time to time, expositions of God's Word which shall treat critically and exegetically the holy text, and in such a style as to meet the need of all. There are many minds and many pens at our command eminently well adapted for this work. The recent revision of the English New Testament, and that of the Old which is coming, will continue to give a marked impetus to

the deeper study of the Bible among ministers and people. To that we shall make our appeal, and of that we shall take advantage. Persuaded as we are that Biblical theology has a noble future before it, and that the more thoroughly it is studied the more entirely it will be found to accord with the best theology dogmatic, we shall let the Scriptures illustrate their own doctrines. But the reader must not suppose that we are promising him the excitement of new and startling expositions of the ancient Word. Of them there are far too many already extant and constantly appearing. We shall be content with only such novelty as modern scientific criticism of the text, and grammatical exegesis of its meaning, may bring to the old doctrine which the old Bible teaches.

But ministers and teachers are by no means our only constituency. We write for the body of the congregation also; and may make our appeal to the heads of Christian houses, who are held responsible for the kind of literature which finds its way into their family circles, and for the effect which it produces. It may be doubted whether this matter receives anything like the attention it deserves: the influence of the reading of the household on its present and future prosperity cannot be exaggerated. Books of obviously immoral, or of doubtful moral, tendency need no remark. Books of latitudinarian or sceptical religious bearing do need it. They abound, and are forcing or insinuating their way into most of our dwellings; and unless there is at the threshold an Index Expurgatorius, and someone within firm enough to enforce it, the result is too obvious to need description. Germs of distrust are lodged in the young mind, which only await their sure development in the soil which a thousand external and internal influences will only too surely cultivate. Habits of criticism and independent judgment are formed strangely inconsistent with "the nurture and admonition of the Lord." Young men and young women into whose early training such works are permitted to enter too often in due time bear the fruits of this worse than neglected education. They have learned to criticise their parents' form of religion; and well if they do not bring Christianity and religion itself before their bar. Their parents one day come to "weep for their children;" but they ought also to weep for themselves

and their own early neglect. But, apart from this, though not altogether independent of it, let it be considered what danger lies in the passion for novel-reading and specifically light reading generally, which is fostered by the habits of the present day. Into how many Christian dwellings is there a continuous influx of the three-volumes, series after series, in an unchecked flow which allows neither time nor inclination for anything more serious or more elevating. This is not exaggeration: we have no disposition to exaggerate on the subject. It would be wrong absolutely to denounce light reading in a household; it would be unreal and mischievous to recommend the exclusion of all books that are not weighted with the most solid truth. There is no need to qualify these remarks or defend our position. Much, very much, of the reading of the present day has no censor either of the press or of the use of what the press sends forth.

But what has this to do with our REVIEW? It has this, at least, to do with it, that the very position of such a work is to be, in the case of those who trust it, a kind of censor of the press. Whatever else it is, that is a duty it must discharge. And our own purpose and hope is to be faithful in pointing out the evil and recommending the good of our current literature. It ought not to be expected that this office will be fully discharged. Such is the portentous prodigality of the press that it would require every page of every issue to notice for approbation or discredit every work that claims the ear of the public. We must needs let shoals of volumes pass through the net; but of these it may be said that they would not pass through if they were thoroughly worthy of being arrested and held up to notice. All the critical and prominent works of every quarter will be more or less carefully noted; certainly, none that are pre-eminently good or pre-eminently bad will be omitted. Meanwhile, judging others we shall have to be judged ourselves; describing others' contributions, we shall make our own contributions too. We hope to provide what may be read from beginning to end with profit. There will be articles biographical, historical, social; essays, not too profound, on philosophy, science, and æsthetics; theological and expository papers not generally beyond the compass of the ordinary reader.

And the REVIEW, bearing this character, will be itself a wholesome literary element in any house: not borrowed for a few days from a library, but as a permanent occupant. In some departments it may be disappointing. It will not present the vehement political essay which is the charm and the stimulant of many of its fellows; and some branches of ecclesiastical controversy will be necessarily omitted. There are also certain social and economical questions which will be very sparingly introduced. In fact, nothing may be expected that might sow discord in the household, or provoke dissension in the community; but, omitting these, there is a large residuum of subjects which may be so treated as to enrich the family reading. Digests of books will be found that shall render the book itself needless; or, as the author would prefer, shall render the book a necessity. Sketches of life and character will be introduced that shall stamp the memories of great men gone upon the minds of the young in the house, and enkindle their emulation. Glimpses will be now and then given of the wonderful pages that science is constantly unrolling to the amazement of all who read, and of the progress of the arts that keep pace with the progress of science. A general view of what English literature is producing will never be wanting; and occasionally a sketch of the literature of the Continent and America will be added. If the promises of the REVIEW are kept, it will be a quarterly addition to the household possessions and the household happiness. It will never introduce anything to be deprecated or feared; it will bring little that is not well worthy of being read and remembered; and, more than that, it will constantly and sedulously endeavour to improve the intellectual and moral habits of all who give it their confidence and make it their friend.

There is but a step between this and the directly religious influence of our work. Upon that, as in duty and conscience bound, we lay great stress. A periodical entering Christian houses, and addressing Christian minds and hearts, without a religious message, would be to us an anomaly indeed. A purely literary organ we do not profess to conduct. The religion of Christ knows no agencies which do not breathe its spirit and promote its spiritual influence. We should not care to be connected with

any such undertaking as this on any other principle than that it shall both directly and indirectly minister to the religious education and edification of those who read it. Perhaps it may be thought that the programme we have just sketched is inconsistent with this. But that would be a mistake, a grievous mistake. "Directly or indirectly" are our words; and for the "indirectly" we claim the great bulk of our work. Much of the religious influence exerted upon the human mind and heart and will is indirect: produced by instruments which have no obvious connection with religion, but which deepen it where it already exists or tend to excite it where it exists not. An article may be so suffused with the religious spirit as, without the word, to lift the mind upward. Not saying anything about God's providence in the world, it may yet tend to reveal vividly to the devout His universal presence and action. It may so describe His wonders as science expounds them as to fill the reader's mind with an awe and a reverence and a childlike trust of which the writer might not himself be conscious, or which at least he did not aim to evoke. Of course, there will be many pages of which hardly this could be said. There will be of necessity articles of a neutral or negative character as it respects religion; but none will be admitted that might affect the tone of the whole as religious and as fostering religion. And the positive tendency will be preserved by some papers which will deal with Holy Scripture and vindicate the moral tone of the REVIEW. Perhaps during the former years of our existence this all-important characteristic may have been sometimes forgotten, or not systematically remembered. If that was ever the case, the fault was owing to a certain class of difficulties which will not henceforward be so active. It is undoubtedly very hard to combine the claims of a literary Journal with those of a religious organ. But the attempt will be made, and as we hope with success.

And now we close our brief salutation and greeting. We have frankly stated our case, urged our claims, made our promises, and pleaded for support. We venture to think that the large community of Methodists will not let our enterprise, under its new conditions, fail. The new conditions, as was said at the outset, are fully and cordially accepted by those who

conduct the REVIEW. They have yielded to the general wish of those whose judgments they are bound to respect. They connect their names with the new experiment because they have been urged to do so; and with the understanding that when complete success crowns the effort they will be released and leave the undertaking to other hands. The public—the Methodist public first, but not alone by any means—must decide the question. If they respond generously, not expecting too much but making all due allowances, they will not be disappointed.

---

## ART. II.—PROFESSOR PALMER.

*The Life and Achievements of Edward Henry Palmer, late Lord Almoner's Professor of Arabic in the University of Cambridge, and Fellow of St. John's College.* By WALTER BESANT, M.A. London: John Murray. 1883. Second Edition.

THE warm interest felt in the sad fate which overtook Professor Palmer and his friends last August, during the revolt of Arabi Pasha, has been shown in many ways, and has made Mr. Besant's book one of the great favourites of the season. It tells the story of a remarkable career—a career full of interest from beginning to end,—and opens up many side-walks of life, known only to few. Mr. Besant has done his task well; as those who knew his powers would expect.

"It is the history of a man who was a great scholar, yet never a book-worm; a great linguist, yet never a pedant; a man of the schools, yet no mere grammarian; a man of the pen and the study, yet one who loved to go about, observant, among his fellow men. . . . He is a *wunder-kind*; in the old days he would have been attributed to the fairies in a benevolent mood. He is unlike anybody else; he possesses strange gifts; all sorts and conditions of men are attracted by him; the grave college don thinks it a privilege to look after him, because he is in practical matters helpless; yet with a misgiving, because he is a new experience, and no one knows what may happen with him; even the Ritualist clergyman, although he knows that Palmer has called him the man dressed in book-markers, regards him with affection. The gipsy, the

any such undertaking as this on any other principle than that it shall both directly and indirectly minister to the religious education and edification of those who read it. Perhaps it may be thought that the programme we have just sketched is inconsistent with this. But that would be a mistake, a grievous mistake. "Directly or indirectly" are our words; and for the "indirectly" we claim the great bulk of our work. Much of the religious influence exerted upon the human mind and heart and will is indirect: produced by instruments which have no obvious connection with religion, but which deepen it where it already exists or tend to excite it where it exists not. An article may be so suffused with the religious spirit as, without the word, to lift the mind upward. Not saying anything about God's providence in the world, it may yet tend to reveal vividly to the devout His universal presence and action. It may so describe His wonders as science expounds them as to fill the reader's mind with an awe and a reverence and a childlike trust of which the writer might not himself be conscious, or which at least he did not aim to evoke. Of course, there will be many pages of which hardly this could be said. There will be of necessity articles of a neutral or negative character as it respects religion; but none will be admitted that might affect the tone of the whole as religious and as fostering religion. And the positive tendency will be preserved by some papers which will deal with Holy Scripture and vindicate the moral tone of the REVIEW. Perhaps during the former years of our existence this all-important characteristic may have been sometimes forgotten, or not systematically remembered. If that was ever the case, the fault was owing to a certain class of difficulties which will not henceforward be so active. It is undoubtedly very hard to combine the claims of a literary Journal with those of a religious organ. But the attempt will be made, and as we hope with success.

And now we close our brief salutation and greeting. We have frankly stated our case, urged our claims, made our promises, and pleaded for support. We venture to think that the large community of Methodists will not let our enterprise, under its new conditions, fail. The new conditions, as was said at the outset, are fully and cordially accepted by those who

conduct the REVIEW. They have yielded to the general wish of those whose judgments they are bound to respect. They connect their names with the new experiment because they have been urged to do so; and with the understanding that when complete success crowns the effort they will be released and leave the undertaking to other hands. The public—the Methodist public first, but not alone by any means—must decide the question. If they respond generously, not expecting too much but making all due allowances, they will not be disappointed.

---

## ART. II.—PROFESSOR PALMER.

*The Life and Achievements of Edward Henry Palmer, late Lord Almoner's Professor of Arabic in the University of Cambridge, and Fellow of St. John's College.* By WALTER BESANT, M.A. London: John Murray. 1883. Second Edition.

THE warm interest felt in the sad fate which overtook Professor Palmer and his friends last August, during the revolt of Arabi Pasha, has been shown in many ways, and has made Mr. Besant's book one of the great favourites of the season. It tells the story of a remarkable career—a career full of interest from beginning to end,—and opens up many side-walks of life, known only to few. Mr. Besant has done his task well; as those who knew his powers would expect.

"It is the history of a man who was a great scholar, yet never a book-worm; a great linguist, yet never a pedant; a man of the schools, yet no mere grammarian; a man of the pen and the study, yet one who loved to go about, observant, among his fellow men. . . . He is a *wunder-kind*; in the old days he would have been attributed to the fairies in a benevolent mood. He is unlike anybody else; he possesses strange gifts; all sorts and conditions of men are attracted by him; the grave college don thinks it a privilege to look after him, because he is in practical matters helpless; yet with a misgiving, because he is a new experience, and no one knows what may happen with him; even the Ritualist clergyman, although he knows that Palmer has called him the man dressed in book-markers, regards him with affection. The gipsy, the

German peasant, the English tramp, the Druse, the Syrian, the Arab, the Persian, the Indian prince, all alike acknowledge the glamour of his presence, obey his bidding, and are ready to follow him, to get up or to sit down at the motion of his finger. A *Wunderkind* indeed!"

Such are the words of the biographer, which are confirmed by the whole tenour of his pages.

Edward Henry Palmer was born in Green Street, Cambridge, on August 7, 1840, and died in August, 1882. Into that short life of forty-two years he compressed all the studies and achievements which Mr. Besant relates. His father kept a private school in Cambridge, and was a man of considerable attainments and strong artistic tastes. Some of his paintings have been preserved, and show great power; but he died of consumption before he was thirty, and the son lost all the help which such a guide might have given him in his studies. Professor Palmer's father died when his child was little more than an infant; and his mother, whose funeral was one of the earliest remembrances of his childhood, soon followed her husband. Fortunately the orphan found a warm friend in an aunt, who was in very good circumstances. She brought him up, and proved herself a true mother in his sorrow. Palmer never spoke of her in after years without the greatest tenderness and emotion.

He was educated first at a private school, then at the Perse Grammar School, but his progress did not encourage his friends to send him to the University. He was to be one of the greatest Oriental scholars of the time but his work lay in unfrequented paths, and there were none who foresaw his future eminence. To one fact of those days, however, subsequent facts give significance: young Palmer became a Romany scholar. He found his way among the travelling tinkers, and gave them sixpence for a lesson; he got into the gipsy tents, and made friends with the men and women, so that he might add a few words to his vocabulary. That love of the gipsies and their language continued through life. He became one of the greatest authorities on all that concerned these curious people, and we are often reminded of George Borrow and his adventures in Spain by the strange incidents which are related in this life.

When Palmer left school a place was found for him in the office of a firm of London merchants. He proved a model business

man, and when he left them the senior partner told him that he was the very best clerk the house had ever had. The office life taught him much ; but, unfortunately, he never learned to look after his own affairs, and thus one of the greatest blessings which City life might have conferred on a literary man and a scholar was lost.

In those first days of London life he became an ardent student of Italian. For a while he plodded on with grammar and syntax ; but he soon put books aside, and spent his evenings where he could hear Italians talk together in their own language. There was a café in Tichborne Street where political exiles and refugees congregated. Here he sat and listened till he mastered the language, and became a warm friend of Italian unity. He was often among the organ-grinders and sellers of plaster-cast images on Saffron Hill, and among the sailors at the docks. In this way he not only became a fluent Italian scholar, but also acquired the dialects of different Italian cities.

French was mastered in the same way. He used to say, in after years, that any intelligent person could learn to read a language in a few weeks, and to speak it in a few months, unless it was his first attempt at an Oriental language. First the language must be studied without grammar, to get the most important part of the actual vocabulary, and in that way a vast amount of grammar and syntax will be learned without trouble.

During his life in London he began to dip into mesmerism, and found that he possessed what was at that time known as mesmeric power in a very remarkable degree. He used it for practical purposes in a singular manner. Late one night he found a woman, who had met with some accident, lying on a door step in great pain. He mesmerised her as she lay, then went for assistance, and carried her to the hospital. We find it mentioned, also, that some years later, at Cambridge, a Trinity undergraduate was suffering from neuralgia. Palmer threw him into a mesmeric trance, and when it ceased the neuralgia was gone. Of late years Palmer ceased to use this power, because it overtaxed his nervous strength ; but to the end of his life he was a curious student of all the problems of spiritualism, and an adept at conjuring.

In 1859 consumptive symptoms appeared, and it was evident [No. CXXI.]—NEW SERIES, VOL. I. NO. I. c

that, unless they could be arrested, he had only a few months to live. He went back to Cambridge that he might die in peace. An herbalist there prescribed a very strong dose of lobelia. Violent vomiting came on; a cold chill laid hold of his feet, crept upward, and struck his heart, which ceased to beat, and his throat, which ceased to breathe. A doctor was sent for in all haste.

"‘I felt myself dying,’ he said. ‘I was being killed by this dreadful cold spreading all over me. I was quite certain that my last moments had arrived. By the bedside stood my aunt, poor soul, crying. I saw the doctor feeling a pulseless wrist, watch in hand; the cold dews of death were on my forehead; the cold hand of death was on my limbs. Up to my lips, but no higher; I thought I was actually dead, and could see and hear, but not speak, not even when the doctor let my hand fall upon the pillow, and said solemnly, ‘He is gone.’”

During this strange experience his mind was perfectly clear. He found himself wishing that he had finished a certain book, and wondering whether he should be able to do this in the next world. But there was much work yet before him. He recovered suddenly from this remarkable attack, and was troubled with no more anxiety about his lungs, except on one occasion.

During these years in London he had formed a warm friendship with Henry Irving, which he kept up to the end of his life. It may have been partly due to that friendship that, after his recovery, he amused himself with acting, and consented to join a professional troupe at Lynn Regis. Fortunately he missed his train, and lost all chance of becoming an actor.

Palmer was now twenty years of age; he was short and spare in figure, with narrow, sloping shoulders, and a contracted chest. In later years he had a slight stoop, caused by constant study. "His eyes were curiously large and limpid, and they protruded, as happens to most linguists." Though slightly built he was full of nervous strength. Walking down Whitechapel one day, a thief made a snatch at his watch; Palmer seized him, and they fell together. The thief kicked and made desperate struggles, but Palmer proved the master, and handled him so severely that when the pickpocket came out of prison his own friends failed to recognize him.

It was not till the close of 1860 that Palmer's attention was directed to Oriental languages. Syed Abdullah, a native of Oudh, who had been translator and interpreter to the Board for the Administration of the affairs of the Punjab, resigned his post in India, and came to England in 1851. He was a man of great force of character, and an eminent Oriental scholar. Palmer joined a class which this man established in Cambridge, and soon became his most promising pupil. He threw himself into his new studies with his usual ardour; sometimes spending as much as eighteen hours a day in close intellectual work. He had now found his vocation, and never regretted his choice. Mr. Besant's comments on Palmer's changed career do not quite satisfy one here:—

"Can any one imagine," he says, "a more splendid change of purpose? Eastcheap, the dock business, the servitude of the desk, the accounts and the ledger—all this finished and done with for ever; henceforth, if you please, the holy atmosphere of a library, and the sacred companionship of books, wise, solemn, sweet, or sad. He was fated to enjoy this companionship for twenty years only; but better ten years in a library than a hundred at a desk."

We do not admire the tone taken in regard to business life conveyed in these words. The world needs men who will devote the same determination and energy to business that Palmer gave to Oriental studies; such men have often been the truest friends of learning, and have used their resources to help those who were busy reaping in the fields of knowledge for the good of the world.

At first Syed Abdullah was Palmer's sole adviser. Soon, however, he found other friends. The son of the late Rajah of Oudh was one of his best helpers. He allowed Palmer to live in his house when he pleased, gave him the assistance of two munshis with whom he might read, and for three years read and criticized Palmer's Persian compositions.

For the next two years Palmer worked zealously at Persian, Arabic and Urdic, cheered by the constant friendship of a little circle of scholars, who took the warmest interest in his progress, and initiated him into the beauties of Eastern literature.

About 1862 he began to think of entering the University of

Cambridge. Those were the days when classics and mathematics were the door to preferment, and little encouragement was given to those who wished for proficiency in other studies. St. John's College, which has won itself much honour as the home of struggling talent, took up Palmer's case. The young man was invited to call on Mr. Todhunter, the mathematician, who was Lecturer and Senior Fellow at St. John's. As the result of that interview Palmer stood for a sizarship at St. John's in October, 1863. He rubbed up his classics, and received a sizarship and scholarship. Those undergraduate days were filled with labour. He had to spend some hours every day in reading Latin and Greek and attending lectures; he had generally one or more pupils reading Arabic with him; he was busy with catalogues of Arabic and Persian MSS.; he was writing Urdic letters for a Lucknow and Agra paper. Amid all these labours he was making such rapid strides in Oriental studies that, in 1866, Professor Mir Aulád Ali, of Trinity College, Dublin, says that he had never, in all his life, met with a single European so well versed in Eastern languages as Palmer.

During these years he took a warm interest in spiritualism. He held séances in his own room, and studied all its manifestations. The result was a "boundless contempt for the whole business, machinery, and pretence of spiritualism, which he maintained to be a swindle of the most palpable and clumsy kind, believed in by credulous and simple persons, who love to think that the veil of the grave can be partially drawn aside, and that they may still exchange greetings, even in faint whispers, with the dead whom they have never ceased to love." Mr. Besant says that he has attended séances with Palmer, and seen the bewilderment and rage of the medium when the word was taken out of his mouth, and spirits quite unknown to him began to convey messages in mysterious tongues. He could draw spirit portraits and produce startling spirit effects, but he did all by ingenious contrivances and combinations which he was ready to explain to his friends.

In course of time he took his B.A. degree. He was not a classical scholar and did not stand well in "honours," but the St. John's tutors determined to help their Oriental scholar by

election to a fellowship. Papers were given him to test his knowledge of Oriental languages ; he passed a brilliant examination, and was at once elected to the vacant fellowship.

Palmer was now in easy circumstances, and felt that he could devote himself quietly to study until some opportunity for the use of his Oriental knowledge should come. This opportunity was supplied by the Palestine Exploration Fund. The intimate connection between Sacred Geography and Bible History was awaking general attention. Captain Wilson, R.E., had conducted a careful survey of Jerusalem, and he and a staff of eminent men were about to begin a survey of Sinai. A competent scholar was needed to collect traditions, names, and legends, copy and decipher inscriptions, observe dialectic differences, &c. Palmer seemed just the man. He could not only read and write Arabic, but could speak it with fluency. The expedition came at a very seasonable hour. Six years of constant strain had so taxed his health that during the first days of the work he could scarcely walk a couple of miles, though long before the survey was completed he was as perfectly fit to undertake the difficult marches, to climb the precipitous rocks, and to cross the deep valleys of Sinai, as any member of the party.

Palmer did his share in this survey—which left little doubt that if the law was given at Jebel Musa or Jebel Serbal, it was at the former—with great pleasure. His special work was to ascertain from the Bedawin the correct nomenclature of the peninsula, and the task was very difficult. The Bedawin could not understand the motives of the travellers, and were totally ignorant of the nomenclature of their neighbours. Palmer took with him the most intelligent of them that he could find, and asked the name of each place as it was noted in the sketch. This name he would never accept without independent and separate testimony. It will easily be seen what a tedious and unsatisfactory task was left in his hands.

The results of the survey may be told in his own words :

“ We are thus able not only to trace out a route by which the children of Israel could have journeyed, but also to show its identity with that so concisely but graphically laid down in the Pentateuch. We have seen,

moreover, that it leads to a mountain answering in every respect to the description of the mountain of the Lord; the chain of topographical evidence is complete, and the maps and sections may henceforth be confidently left to tell their own tale."

The rough life in the desert gave Palmer the greatest enjoyment. "He liked the camping in tents, the fine air of the desert, the simple fare, the fatigues of the day, and the rest of the evening." But the great feature of the journey was the intercourse with the Arabs. The results of his study of the life and customs of these Sinai Bedawin is given in his interesting book on the "Desert of the Exodus:"

"In dress, speech and manners these men are probably just the same as in the time of the patriarchs. They have their winter and summer camping grounds, and do not wander except from one to the other; they are not robbers or murderers, though they resent the intrusion of any unauthorized person upon their territory; they have no history, they boast no nationality, they possess no organization. They have prayers for sunrise and sunset, and for the hour of sleep, and every prayer is prefaced with these words: 'I desire to pray, and I seek guidance from God; for good and pure prayers come from God alone. Peace be upon our Lord Abraham, and our Lord Mohammed.'"

This book, the "Desert of the Exodus," contains the following spirited translation of a poem composed by a camel-driver, after a great flood in 1867, which washed away a whole Arab encampment. Forty souls were lost, and many camels, sheep, and other cattle.

"I dreamed a dream, which filled my soul with fear;  
 Fresh grief came on me, but the wise have said,  
 When sorrow cometh joy is hovering near.  
 Methought I looked along a forest glade,  
 And marvelled greatly how the trees did rear  
 Their heads to heaven; when lo! a whirlwind laid  
 Their trunks all prostrate. Then I looked again,  
 And what but now like fallen trees had seemed  
 Were forms of warriors untimely slain.  
 Again my fancy mocked me, and I dreamed  
 Of storms and floods, of fierce resistless rain,  
 Of vivid lightnings that above me gleamed;—  
 And yet, again, dead men around me lay,  
 Dead men in myriads around me slept,  
 Like the great gathering of the Judgment Day.  
 I woke—a torrent through the wady leapt;

Nile had its ancient barriers burst away  
And over Feiráns' peaceful desert swept,  
Nor spared he any in his angry mood  
Save one—to be the river-monster's food."

In the summer of 1869 the survey party returned to England, but Palmer's work in the desert had only just begun. It was important to survey the great desert of the wanderings of the Israelites, and Palmer undertook this task, in company with a young travelling bachelor of Cambridge university, Mr. Charles Tyrwhitt Drake. Weakness of the chest and a tendency to asthma had cut short Mr. Drake's university life. He had already travelled in Algiers and Morocco, and visited the Sinaitic peninsula. He was an invaluable companion. He had some knowledge of Arabic, was a good all-round naturalist, could sketch well, and possessed an inexhaustible fund of courage and cheerfulness. "Never once during the whole of our journey did I know Drake out of temper, out of heart, or discouraged." This was Palmer's testimony when he was called to lament Drake's early death in 1874.

The two travellers were to investigate certain points in the north-east of the peninsula, to try to settle the site of Kadesh, to search in the Land of Moab for inscriptions, and generally to get as much information as possible about the desert of the wandering. They went without dragoman or escort, with a tent six feet square and five feet high, mattresses, blankets, a kettle, pot, and frying pan, with tin plates, knives, forks, and washing basins, instruments, and photographic apparatus. They were supplied with a three months' store of tea, flour, bacon, onions, tobacco, sugar, Liebig's Extract, and brandy. Four camels bore all, and the owners of the camels, changed in passing from tribe to tribe, were their only companions.

In this expedition Palmer relied on his power of managing the people. He was like one of the Arabs themselves, and never failed to feel sympathy with all the strolling Arabs he met in his journey.

Leaving Suez on December 16, they struck southwards for Jebel Musa, which was reached in twelve days. After searching the convent library for old manuscripts, and exploring the neighbourhood, they struck northwards, marching ten miles

a day, and exploring the country right and left. They worked on an average fourteen to sixteen hours a day in this march between Sinai and Jerusalem. The results of the first part of this adventurous journey were full of interest to all students of the Desert of the Wandering, but perhaps the most important result was the friendship which Palmer established with the Arab chieftains. He became known among them as the Sheikh Abdullah, and was able last year to return to them as an old friend.

From Jerusalem they set out for Hebron to explore the east side of the desert to Petra. This finished their expedition. A good story of this journey often amused Palmer's friends. One of their guides brought a testimonial to his wonderful honesty. When the travellers looked at it, they found that it was a document in English setting forth that this man was a most rapacious scoundrel, and that every one must be on their guard against him. The travellers had already put themselves under his guidance, and soon had a taste of his quality, for next day the cook appeared tearing out handfuls of hair, and beating his breast. The guide was going to desert them and leave them alone in the wilderness: £25 induced him to remain, however, and he guided them safely to Jerusalem. The story had a tragic ending. At Jerusalem Palmer complained to the Turkish Governor. The sheikh was already known by similar acts, and was in arrears with his tribute. Speedy vengeance was taken. On reaching Damascus they were asked if they should know their guide again. The official clapped his hands, when a soldier brought in a sack containing four heads, one of which belonged to the unfortunate guide. Such is Eastern justice!

The results of his journey were manifold. A paper which he contributed to the *British Quarterly* gives some curious facts which he gathered about the "Secret Sects of Syria." He also gained the material for his great work on the "Desert of the Exodus," proved the rich fertility in former times of the country south of Palestine, discovered the site of Kibroth-Hattaavah, and collected a vast quantity of traditions and legends. Perhaps most important of all were the researches which he began to make about the Temple area and its modern buildings in the

works of Arab writers. These researches led to some very interesting results.

On Palmer's return to England, in the autumn of 1870, he had to prepare the report of his journey for the Palestine Exploration Fund, which was published in January of the next year. A few months later Messrs. Bell & Daldy published his "*Desert of the Exodus*," admirably illustrated. In the same year he and Mr. Besant prepared a history of Jerusalem from the siege of Titus. Mr. Besant told the story from Christian sources; Palmer undertook to gather together of the accounts given by Mohammedan historians.

That same year the Professorship of Arabic at Cambridge became vacant, and Palmer sent in his name as a candidate. He was known over all the world of Oriental scholarship; his work in the survey of the desert and his publications had made his name known in outside circles; he was a graduate of the University, and a Fellow of St. John's. The position would have given him all that he desired both in honour and income, but the heads of colleges passed him over, and elected an eminent scholar who was not a member of the University. This result was a sore disappointment to Palmer and his friends. "It embittered," says Mr. Besant, "the whole of his future connection with the University; it never was forgotten or forgiven."

In the year of this great disappointment the Lord Almoner's Professorship of Arabic fell vacant. It was worth only £40 a year, but it allowed its holder to retain his fellowship even if he married. Dean Wellesley, then Queen's Almoner, gave this appointment to Palmer, and the day afterwards he was married to Miss Laura Davis. She was twenty-one, singularly beautiful, tall, and fair. They took a little house in Cambridge, then moved to a larger one in Nuneham till Mrs. Palmer's failing health compelled them to fly to Paris and then to Bournemouth.

The early years of his Professorship were full of work. Happily in the year after he began his work his annual stipend was augmented by £250 in consequence of the newly established Oriental Triposes, and the professor's income was now abundant for his wants. He was expected to be in residence for eighteen weeks, and to give three courses of lectures

in Arabic, Persian, and Hindustani. Pupils also came to read with him, so that his teaching work occupied three or four hours every day.

He was becoming widely known. One day a little note from Manchester came to hand enclosing a short document in Persian, a warrant or ticket for certain goods of given size and quality. He sent his translation, and received a ten-pound note with these words:—"Dear Sir, hooray for old Cambridge! This is what the Oxford chap said it was.—Yours truly, ——." The paper had been sent to the Oxford man, who said that it appeared to be a copy of an ancient Persian inscription, probably taken from a tomb or a triumphal column, &c.

When the Shah of Persia visited this country in 1873 Professor Palmer acted as one of his interpreters, and wrote an account of the visit in Urdic, which filled 35 columns of the *Oude Akhbar*. He also contributed to the same paper a long description of the Duke of Edinburgh's marriage. An Arabic grammar, a Persian dictionary, and the text and translation of the works of an Arab poet, filled up all the intervals of teaching.

In 1880 he prepared a life of the Caliph Haroun Alraschid for a series of biographies published by Marcus Ward & Co. It is a curious fact that no biography of the famous hero of the "Arabian Nights" had ever been written. We have spent some pleasant moments in turning over the pages of this book. The caliph is a true Eastern despot, a man of great talents, but spoiled by arbitrary power. His murder of Jaafer, the companion of so many of his midnight rambles, is one of the darkest spots on his memory.

"He was," says Professor Palmer, "a man of great talents, keen intellect, and strong will. The eloquence and impetuosity of his discourse, as shown in those speeches of his which have been preserved, were remarkable even for a time when eloquence was cultivated and regarded as the greatest accomplishment. . . . He was spoilt, he was a bloodthirsty despot, he was a debauchee; but he was also an energetic ruler, he humbly performed the duties of his religion, and he strove his utmost to increase, or at least preserve intact, the glorious inheritance that had been handed down to him. . . . When he could shake off his imperial cares, he was a genial, even an amusing companion, and all around him liked him, although such as ventured to sport with him did so with the sword of the executioner suspended above their heads."

A new translation of the "Quran" (Koran) for the Clarendon Press; the laborious work of editing, with Mr. Besant, the "Survey of Western Palestine;" and preparing a series of grammars, published by Mr. Trübner, on a new and a simple basis, kept his hands very full. His last great piece of work was the revision of Henry Martyn's Persian New Testament. For six or eight months he and Dr. Bruce spent three hours every day, from eleven to two, on this work.

Palmer was always writing verse. Many a leisure moment was employed in making metrical translations of Arabic or Swedish poetry. He joined Miss Janet Tucker and Mr. Charles Leland in publishing a volume of gipsy songs, but no one can tell whether the English in the Romany versions were written first. We have given his spirited translation of the camel-driver's lament over the victims of the flood of 1867; but perhaps the following lines will be more acceptable than any other as a specimen of his skill as a verse-maker. They tell the story of his own courtship.

"I felt the flood-gates open fly,  
And poured my secret in her ear,  
And paused awhile for her reply.  
With hope, though somewhat mixed with fear,  
It came; a little word that sent  
Through all my frame a joyous thrill;  
And gently on my arm there leaned  
Those tiny fingers, trembling still.  
The merry stream flowed on apace  
Beneath the shady chestnut-trees;  
And lo! another smiling face  
Was turned to catch the balmy breeze."

The chapter of this book, entitled "Recreations of a Pundit," shows us how Palmer unbent his mind. Everything that required dexterity had a charm for him. Pretymann, son of the late Dean of Lincoln, and a Cambridge man of his own standing, sometimes joined him in excursions to the Fens. At Holywell, near St. Ives, there is a favourite resort of the gipsies, and Palmer often found his way among them. One evening a gipsy friend of his told him that he had walked forty miles carrying a bag of pheasants, and that they were lying at his feet. Palmer expressed neither praise nor blame, but simply

advised him to wash the wrapper round his neck, which was covered with blood and feathers. His friend, Mr. Leland, says that he could fill a volume with the eccentric adventures which they had in common. Their knowledge of Romany, and Palmer's proficiency at "thimble-rig," "ringing the changes," picking pockets, "card-sharping," and every kind of legerdemain, made the wandering gipsies look upon them as beings of a higher caste, just as the Spanish gipsies looked on George Borrow. This chapter will well repay perusal. One curious illustration of his presence of mind is worth telling. During his first visit to the East, Palmer was betrayed by a treacherous guide into the hands of a party of Arab robbers, who prepared to rob and kill him. His captors began to treat him rudely. At first Palmer took no notice, but when the rudeness became more marked, he sprang up in a rage and cursed them all. "This to *me*!" he roared, and drawing from his pocket a letter from an English lady, he exclaimed as he flourished it, "Down on your knees, you dogs, and kiss the handwriting of the Sultan." The 300 robbers were utterly cowed, and Palmer escaped without injury.

We have already seen his interest in mesmerism and spiritualism. In conjuring he became such an adept that when he met some Italian gipsies in Germany, and showed them his tricks, they begged him to go away, and keep quiet, lest he should bring discredit on their own performances. When Thought-reading was first talked of two years ago, he gave a good deal of attention to it, and with the application of the knowledge and skill derived in legerdemain and mesmerism, Mr. Besant says that "he arrived at results quite as extraordinary as those recorded of Mr. Bishop."

Early in 1878 Mrs. Palmer died of consumption at Bournemouth. She had been ill for upwards of two years, and the heavy expenses of her long affliction seriously crippled their resources. Through all his sorrows he struggled like a brave man, "without any abatement of zeal, though every moment was full of torture." Next year he married again. He had two little girls who sorely needed a mother's care, and he found true and warm affection in his German bride. Gossamer days, indeed, were those they spent in Wales and in Germany. They took a

house in London near Swiss Cottage, and Palmer ran down to Cambridge from Monday to Friday for his lectures. He was beginning to feel his University work very irksome. Just then he lost the few hundreds which he had saved and given into the care of his aunt, as well as all his hopes of fortune, by her death without a will. He became seriously embarrassed, and sequestering his fellowship and professorship to clear off liabilities, left Cambridge and devoted himself to work in London. It was like beginning life afresh. He was an occasional writer for the *Saturday Review*, *Athenæum*, *Academy*, and *Times*, and he examined for the Civil Service Commission. At the age of forty-one he began to write for the *Standard*.

From August, 1881, until his expedition to Egypt, he was a journalist. He was always ready for work, and did his work well, so that he soon became one of the regular staff of the paper. He took a house in Mecklenburgh Square, Bloomsbury and lucrative work came in from all quarters. His attainments were universally recognized, and he was surrounded by friends.

In the midst of Palmer's prosperity the trouble with Arabi Pasha arose. The safety of the Suez Canal and the chances of support which Arabi had among the fanatic tribes of the Desert began to excite serious apprehension. East of the Canal there is an immense recruiting ground, and if the sheikhs of the tribes declared for revolt, a religious war of vast magnitude would soon be kindled.

On the 24th of June, last year, Captain Gill called at Mecklenburgh Square, on behalf of the Admiralty, to ask Palmer for information about the Sinai Arabs. Palmer told him that the best way would be to find some one whom they could trust to visit the sheikhs and arrange matters personally with them. On Monday they met again and renewed the discussion. In the afternoon he received an invitation to breakfast with Lord Northbrook next morning, and in a few days it was arranged that he himself should undertake this difficult mission.

He was the only man who personally knew some of the sheikhs and would travel among them as an old friend. The way of duty was clear, and he yielded to the wishes of the Admiralty. His instructions were not written down, but it was understood that he was to go to the Desert and the

Peninsula of Sinai, to travel about among the people that he might learn what measure of excitement was felt, and how far the tribes were inclined to join Arabi. He was to learn how they might most effectually be detached from the cause of Arabi, or led to assist the British interest in some other way. He was also to take what steps might be necessary to preserve the Canal, or to repair it if Arabi should injure it in any way.

From Alexandria he steamed to Jaffa, and after obtaining all provisions for his journey, set off on his difficult mission. He was armed with a pass from the Khedive which commended him to the care of all employés of the Viceregal government.

A month of great suspense for Palmer's friends followed. He was in the Desert, travelling sometimes for twelve hours through the most scorching heat, wind, and dust that he had ever felt. He was known among the tribes as the Sheikh Abdullah come back with wealth to his old friends and ready to enrich them all. The Teyáhah, the strongest and most warlike tribe, were ready to do anything for him and he thought that he could raise 40,000 men to defend the Canal.

On the 1st of August he was safe in Suez, with his good news from the Desert. The ships' companies fêted him, and Lord Northbrook telegraphed that he was appointed "Interpreter in Chief" to H.M.'s Forces in Egypt, and placed on the staff.

In another week Captain Gill had arrived at Suez, and Palmer received authority to expend £20,000 in winning over the Desert tribes to the English alliance. For the present he was only to take £3,000. He had arranged for a great meeting of the sheikhs; and on August 8th he and Captain Gill, Lieut. Charrington, a dragoman, and cook, started under the conduct of Meter abu Sofieh and his nephew. At midnight, two days later, the party was attacked by Bedawin. The nephew of Meter was told to escape to Suez with the £3,000, but went to his uncle's camp in the desert of the Tih, and sent no succour to the Englishmen. Meter too escaped. It is hard to unravel the net, but Meter seems to have betrayed Palmer and his friends into the hands of the Bedawin in hope of booty. He does not seem to have sought to murder them, and offered money for their release, but the Bedawin refused to accept the ransom. Mr. Besant thinks that orders had come from Cairo that the men should be murdered; but Colonel

Warren, who caught and examined some of those concerned in this dreadful outrage, and who has the best right to be heard, thinks that it was only the desire of securing the rich booty.

The unfortunate prisoners were brought into one of the wadies, and obliged to climb up the steep cliff to the plateau overlooking the gully into which they were to be cast. They stood in a row, facing the gorge, and five Bedawin were posted, one behind each of the prisoners, to shoot them. They were driven towards the edge of the gully, and one of the men shot at Professor Palmer and killed him. The other unfortunate men now tried to escape, but were overtaken and shot. Capt. Gill only is said to have been alive when the murderers reached the bottom of the wady, but they thrust their swords through each of the party to make sure of their bloody deed.

Before the end Palmer tried to avert their fate by solemnly cursing the Bedawin. It was a last resource, impressive to those wild desert men as a prophecy of God's vengeance; but it did not avail to save them from this sad and tragic end.

Eight months later the bodies of the three murdered Englishmen were laid to rest in St. Paul's. They had all died for their country, and many hearts were sad as men thought of that wild scene in the Desert.

Professor Palmer had given himself to England in her need. He had left his peaceful life in Bloomsbury to go out to the Desert, because he seemed the only man who could do the work. He knew that he would not be forgotten by the nation. He knew also that his wife and children would be cared for if he fell; and he made no bargain, but left himself in the hands of those whom he was trying to serve. Mr. Besant makes bitter comments on the fact that the man of letters should have been allowed to go on such an errand; but while we share all his regrets for Palmer's untimely end, we must not forget that he was the only man who could attempt this work with any probability of success. The man of letters was needed, and he gave himself without reserve. His countrymen have honoured him with a place in our great Cathedral, and they will not suffer the wife and children who mourn his loss to lack anything that a grateful country can do to lighten the burden of sorrow and care which his death has so suddenly brought upon them.

### ART. III.—THE COMPLETED CHURCH BOOKS OF WESLEYAN METHODISM.

1. *The Book of Public Prayers and Services for the Use of the People called Methodists: Including the Order of Morning Prayer and the Revised Forms of Office. With an Appendix.* London: Wesleyan Methodist Book-room, 1883.
2. *The Order of Administration of the Sacraments among the Wesleyan Methodists, and other Services, with an Appendix.* 1883.
3. *The [Revised] Catechisms of the Wesleyan Methodists. Containing a Summary of Scripture Doctrine and Bible History,* 1882.
4. *John Wesley, The Church of England, and Wesleyan Methodism. Their Relation to each other clearly and fully explained in Two Dialogues:—I. Was John Wesley a High Churchman? II. Is Modern Methodism Wesleyan Methodism?* Prepared and Published at the request of the Wesleyan Book Committee, 1883.

THE Wesleyan Conference Office has lately published "The Book of Public Prayers and Services for the Use of the People called Methodists," and also, separately, under the title of "Order of Administration of the Sacraments and other Services," that which forms the latter portion of the Book. The same Appendix is given in both the larger and the smaller publications, being entitled: "Appendix containing the Legal Directions Relative to the Solemnization of Marriages in Wesleyan Chapels, and the Burial Laws Amendment Act, 1880." Twelve months before, the Conference publishing house issued a revised edition of "The Catechisms of the Wesleyan Methodists, Nos. 1 and 2." All these publications concur in teaching the same lesson. The independent ecclesiastical organization of the Methodist Societies has now been deliberately completed. The independent position of a fully organized Church has been irrevocably fixed for Wesleyan Methodism. Doubtless, this was so, in fact, many years before. But the fact is now no longer a matter of inference,

or merely an assumption that underlies, or a consummation which has been reached unconsciously; it is constituted a declared and essential element in the definition of Wesleyan Methodism. Nearly ninety years ago—by the Conference legislation of 1795 and 1797—Methodism virtually claimed for its itinerant preachers, separated to the work of the ministry, the character and prerogatives of pastors, and guaranteed to its congregations all essential Church rights, in regard not only to sacramental administrations, but also to the concurrence, co-operation, and co-responsibility of the laity with the ministry in matters spiritual and temporal. Years before that period, indeed, as is shown in detail in the little book which stands fourth on our list of text-books for this article, John Wesley himself had laid the foundations, in the Methodist economy and in his own administration, of an independent ecclesiastical constitution for Methodism, and he had more than once or twice spoken of his people as constituting a "Church." But still, so strongly, and at first so inextricably, were the fibres of connection with and dependence upon the Church of England, as part of the individual convictions and life of many of the members, interwoven, throughout a large part of the societies, with the specific and distinctive Methodist life and growth, that the Conference could only leave time and circumstance, and natural laws of growth and tendency, to carry on and consummate the work of separate and independent Church formation and organization, of which they had admitted the principles and laid the foundation. For many years, accordingly, it was hard for an outsider to understand whether the Methodist Society claimed to be an independent Church or not. Many of the people still looked to the parish church as their original home, resorted to it on special occasions, and acknowledged, so to speak, its *suzerainty*. An increasing number, however, from year to year, owned no allegiance whatever to the Established Church, and were more or less impregnated with the Dissenting tone and spirit of seventy years ago,—a less embittered and less *doctrinaire* spirit than that of the present day's "Political Dissent." For nearly thirty years after Wesley's death the Methodist preachers held fast to the rule which, soon after his death, as a concession to one class of their people—those strongly attached to the Church

of England—they had agreed to—not to style themselves *Reverend*, but only “preachers of the gospel.” But before thirty years were completed, universal custom and the strong feeling of their own people prevailed, and the Wesleyan readers of the *Methodist Magazine* felt that a needless and injurious confession of inferiority, not only as respected their ministers, but themselves and their Church, was removed when the ministers, whose portraits were published in the *Magazine*—and the style of whose portraiture from this time improved—were no longer entitled otherwise than other ministers, but were recognized by the customary title of *Reverend*. This change, so universally welcome, was a sign that the old generation of Church-Methodists had almost disappeared, and that the Methodist Society would soon assume, without any compromise, without any “bated breath,” its position as an independent community.

Two parallel movements, in fact, were taking place. One of these was by way of developing and organizing the co-operation of the laity in the administration of Methodism, and of guarding with increasing care and constitutional jealousy any infringement of the rights of the laity, whether as official or as private members of the Society. The other movement was by way of defining, developing and enforcing the rights and duties of the ministers, regarded as the pastors and teachers of the Societies, as the common pastorate of a Connexional Church, throughout which they circulated according to a strictly regulated itinerancy, and which was organized generally on Presbyterian principles. Of these two movements, the latter—the definition and development of the rights of the laity—may be said to have attained its goal in the legislation of 1878, which gave lay representation a distinct and equal position in the Annual Conference in regard to all matters not recognised and defined as belonging to the proper pastoral responsibility of the ministers assembled as the common pastorate of the Connexion. The other movement may be said to have completed itself in the adoption and publication of the standards of Connexional authority, which are placed first and third at the head of this article—the Book of Public Prayers and Services and the Catechisms.

These two together answer to the Prayer Book of the Church

of England. But the Methodist Catechisms are of such a character as to require their publication in a separate form. They could not conveniently be included in the Book of Public Prayers and Services. It is hazarding little to say that they are the most comprehensive and the most carefully prepared at least of modern catechisms known in England, if not in the world. They are not the first catechisms which Wesleyan Methodism has published. John Wesley altogether disapproved of the Church Catechism for the use of young children, but at the same time knew the vast importance of teaching young children by means of a suitable catechism. He accordingly prepared a "Short Catechism" himself. This "Short Catechism" was drawn up in 1743, the year in which Wesley first published the "Rules of the Society" for his "United Societies." When, however, the "United Societies" had grown up into a large Connexion, and had become in reality an independent Church, the "Short Catechism" was no longer adequate or in all respects suitable. Accordingly, in 1821, the *Conference Catechisms*, Nos. 1 and 2, were published. These catechisms were, in large part, a compilation from Wesley's Short Catechism, from Dr. Watts' Catechism, from the Catechism of the Church of England, and from the Shorter Westminster Catechism, to which last they owed more than to all the rest. The compilation, however, was so ably done, mainly by the eminent Methodist theologian, Richard Watson, so skilful were the adaptations and modifications, and the properly Wesleyan part—the original portions of the Catechism—were so clear and satisfactory, that the Catechisms were at once accepted by the Methodist Societies as standards of unimpeachable authority. Their excellence was universally recognized. They were, after a few years, adopted by the great Methodist Episcopal Church of America, and continued in use there until, in 1852, that Church published its own new Catechisms. In this country they held their ground for sixty years, but were last year, after several years spent in the work of revision, displaced by the new Catechisms. Of these two, as of their predecessors, the first is intended for children of very tender years, the second for those not so young.

Notwithstanding the excellence of the Catechisms of 1821 it

had, for some years past, been felt that Methodism needed to possess Catechisms more purely and characteristically her own—Catechisms to a larger extent an emanation from her own life, more perfectly moulded and conformed throughout, not only to the theology of Wesley, but to the suggestions of the Church's experience—the experience of the Methodist Church—as those suggestions have accumulated during the half century and more which has passed away since Richard Watson prepared the Catechisms of 1821. At that time Methodism had barely emerged from its merely-society stage of existence. Now for fifty years it has been feeling that it is bound to express and fulfil all that belongs to its unique position, as being in this English realm the representative evangelical Arminian Church. The new Methodist Catechisms, though intended primarily, are not intended solely, for children. And whether intended for children, or for others desiring to be instructed in Wesleyan Methodist doctrine, they should of necessity be shaped and inspired in accordance with the complete experience as well as the fundamental theology of Methodism. The new Catechisms may well be expected to answer not less truly and fully to the Church-character and Church-life of living Methodism than to the precious and indestructible society-character of Primitive Methodism, out of which the forces and faculties of existing Methodism have developed.

In this article we cannot attempt to enter into detail in any description of the new Catechisms, or any comparison of the new with those which they have replaced. On this subject a paper will be found in the *Wesleyan Methodist Magazine* for October, 1882. Here our attention is limited to one aspect of the case—to the manner in which the new Catechisms express the fully developed Church-character of Methodism, and the pastoral responsibility of the ministers of the body, as the intervening half-century has brought these features of Methodism from comparative latency into prominence, from a condition of half unconsciousness, or, at most, of imperfect recognition, into the fullest light of conscious recognition and responsibility. The writer in the *Wesleyan Magazine* says that—

“In preparing the new Catechisms there has been no violent or gratuitous

departure from the model offered by the catechisms of 1821. The fundamental ideas and the general form and order of thought are alike in the two pairs. There is development, not contrariety—evolution, not discord. One chapter may have its parts unfolded into distinct chapters, but the general symmetry is only made thereby the clearer and fuller. Or a chapter may be inserted, but it is seen at once to be ‘a missing link.’ It strengthens the cohesion of the whole and completes the circle. It represents in its place and measure the up-growth into consciousness and recognition of the pastoral idea in Methodism during the last half-century. It answers to the developed responsibility which the completed Church-character of Methodism has imposed on its ministers and people.”

To one illustration of the difference between 1821 and 1882 we may refer, although our space is strictly limited, and although we refuse to notice any others. In the second Catechism of 1821 there was a section entitled *The Sacraments*, and one immediately following it entitled *The Word of God and Prayer*. About the Church and Church fellowship as such nothing was said. In the Catechism of 1882, for the two sections we have named we have, as a substitute, the following: “*Of the Church and the Means of Grace*,” with five subsections as follows: (1) *The Church or Christian Society*, (2) *The Sacraments*, (3) *The Word of God*, (4) *Worship and Prayer*, (5) *The Lord's Prayer*.

From the sub-section as to the *Church or Christian Society* we will quote four successive questions and answers, omitting however, the Scripture proofs, which are given in illustration and confirmation of the answers to the first and third of the questions:

“*What are the chief marks by which Christian Churches are known in the world?*—Assembling to worship in the name of Jesus, and observing the Sacraments appointed by Him.

“*How is the spiritual life of a Christian Church best maintained?*—One chief means of maintaining it is close spiritual fellowship in private assemblies of the Church.

“*What was the practice of the first Christians?*—Spiritual fellowship was one of the special marks of the primitive Church, from its beginning at Jerusalem.

“*What peculiar provision is made for spiritual fellowship among the Methodists?*—They meet together in small companies for fellowship and mutual edification.”

Our chief object, however, in the present article, is to call

attention to the important and significant textbook which heads the list at the beginning of our article. At length, Wesleyan Methodists have a complete Church Service of their own. Up to the present time, many scores of Wesleyan Churches, many thousand members of Wesleyan congregations—all who used that national English form of Morning Service which John Wesley taught all those congregations to use and love which he himself, with his brother Charles, completely organized into an independent Church form—in particular in London and Bristol—have had, practically, no alternative but to use that service as given in the Church of England Prayer-Book. This has worked evil in many ways. Many outsiders may not think it an evil that it was a direct training of Methodist young people for the Church of England. But, at least, from the modern, from the practical Methodist point of view, such a course must be regarded as suicidal. If the Methodist Church is worth preserving and developing in fullest and highest efficiency, then to have no Church service-book for ordinary congregational use but the Book of Common Prayer, with all that it contains and consecrates, is an extraordinary custom to cherish. The Church of England Prayer-Book points the worshipper to another Church-centre and another Church-home, and, when used in a Methodist place of worship, does, in effect, reprove the Methodist Church for its want of a service-book of its own, and cannot but be taken by many to imply, on the part of the Methodist body, conscious inferiority and illegitimacy as respects its Church character. But this is not all, nor is it the most serious consideration in the case. The Book of Common Prayer contains the Catechism of the Church of England, which teaches that in baptism an infant is made “a member of Christ, a child of God, and an inheritor of the Kingdom of Heaven.” It contains the Order for the Visitation of the Sick, and with it the germs of the Popish doctrines of Confession and Absolution. It contains the Baptismal Services which, in the view of a large majority of the people of England, including a majority of Wesleyan ministers and people, strongly favour—not only by their phraseology, but by their arrangement, and by what they ignore as well as what they contain—the dogma of baptismal regeneration. In the form of infant bap-

tism the parental part and responsibility in the baptismal rite are reduced to a nullity. In regard to the training of the children by the parents, there is neither exhortation nor prayer.

Nor are there wanting, even in the Morning Office of Prayer itself, some expressions which, though they cover little space and are contained in few words, have always caused serious difficulty and offence to a considerable number of the Methodist people.

Indeed, the aspect of the case on which we are now dwelling has for many years been recognized generally among thoughtful and well-informed Wesleyans as exceedingly serious, and the action taken at length by the Conference in 1874 did but give expression and effect to a feeling which had long and largely prevailed in the Connexion. In that year the Conference appointed a select committee "to consider the subject of revising the Liturgy and the Book of Offices"—of which Book of occasional services the substance had been taken with no great amount of change from the Church Prayer Book—"especially with a view to the removal of all expressions which are fairly susceptible of a sense contrary to the principles of our Evangelical Protestantism." And the Church Service Book, with the "Order of Administration of the Sacraments," which have lately issued from the Conference press, are, in fact, the outcome of the labours of that committee during the intervening years since 1874, and of the discussions on the subject throughout the district meetings of Methodism, and at several successive Conferences between 1877 and 1882.

But there are still other though minor reasons why such a Service Book as we have described was needed—and had, indeed, long been needed—by Methodism.

Although the Morning Service of the Church of England is used in many Wesleyan chapels, the Evening Service is never used in any—or, at least, such a use is the very rarest exception—a thing scarcely ever heard of. Wesleyan congregations do not desire, and are never likely to desire, that a large number of prayers and formularies, however excellent, which are verbally identical, should be used consecutively in two public services on the same day. And they will have lost the true Methodist spirit

altogether when they cease to desire that, in at least one principal public service on the Lord's Day, full scope may be left for free prayer, and ample time to the preacher for enlargement and pleading in his discourse to the congregation. The consequence is, that although, where the Liturgy is used, the morning psalms for the day are read in course, the evening psalms are not used. Thus half the Psalter is neglected on the arrangement which has hitherto obtained. Can anything be imagined more offensive to a right sense of what is due to the Psalter, and to ecclesiastical propriety, than such systematic neglect of one-half the Book of Psalms?

Another consideration suggesting the desirableness of a Methodist Service-Book for congregational use, is the difficulty experienced in chapels where the Liturgy is used by Methodist new-comers from country parts, in following the service from point to point as it is found in the Prayer Book of the Church of England. Country Methodists feel the need of an easy and plainly arranged Service-Book which they may be able to follow without confusion or difficulty.

Acting on such grounds as have now been indicated, the Committee of Revision have produced, and the Conference Office has published, the volume which stands first in the list of books at the head of this article. It contains the Morning Service so arranged that a Methodist from the country will easily and quickly be able to follow it, and yet such that a member of the Church of England, coming into a Methodist chapel, will be sensible of very little variation from the service of his own church, and may find himself altogether at ease and at home as he joins in the Methodist service. He will find, very nearly as in his own church, three forms of service, one with the Litany, another without, and a third with the Ten Commandments and a part of the Pre-Communion Service. He will observe one or two repetitions of the Lord's Prayer avoided, and that a few words have been omitted from the form of absolution, so called. If an Evangelical Churchman, he will probably approve of the slight, yet hardly insignificant, abridgment of that form. He will find, too, that to meet the case of scrupulous ministers or fastidious congregations, an alternative collect is given, which may, if it appears best, be used instead

of the form known as the "Absolution." Beyond this he will discover very few and minor changes—hardly more or more important than every Wesleyan minister has always been accustomed to make in reading the service, as, for example, when the congregation is led to pray for a blessing, not upon "bishops, priests, and deacons" merely, but upon "all ministers of the Gospel." In the prayer for the High Court of Parliament he will probably not disapprove the change which for the words "our most religious and gracious Queen," has substituted, "our Sovereign Lady, the Queen;" and in the Litany neither his principles nor his taste will probably be offended by reading the insertion which has transformed one of the petitions into "That it may please Thee to endue *the High Court of Parliament*, the Lords of the Council, and all the nobility with grace, wisdom, and understanding," an insertion which not only adds weight and fitness to the petition, but renders it no less proper than desirable to shorten the over-long service, when the Litany is used, by the omission of the separate prayer for Parliament. Such changes as these—and we think we have mentioned all of any account—make less difference between the Wesleyan Prayer-Book and the English Book of Common Prayer, than between the American Episcopalian Liturgy and that of our own country, and not more, we believe, than between the Irish Revised and the English Prayer-Book—if so much. The Psalms are divided for daily use, as in the Prayer-Book—only by days merely, and not for morning and evening also,—the authorized version being substituted for the inferior Prayer-Book version. The Collects and the Gospel and Epistle for the day remain unaltered.

The nationality of character in the Sunday-morning services is thus preserved, and no hindrance is placed in the way of those persons who, having been accustomed to the use of the Book of Common Prayer, may seek in Methodist churches the benefit of a peculiarly evangelical ministry.

At the same time, that which in the Book of Common Prayer was regarded as objectionable has been done away, chiefly by means of changes which, though important, are very small, and all that belongs to the official completeness of a Wesleyan Methodist Service-Book has been inserted. The

Communion Office, varied only by a few words from that of the Church of England; the revised Baptismal Offices, the Wesleyan form of Ordination, the Service for the renewal of the Covenant by members of the Methodist Societies, the Marriage Service, and the Burial Service, each (except the Baptismal Offices) with the alteration of but a few words, are all included in this Service-Book.

And, moreover, there is one other—the final—section in this Church book, entitled, “Articles of Religion;” not the Thirty-nine Articles, but John Wesley’s Twenty-five Articles. These are, in part, a selection and in part an abridgment, intended originally to form a substitute for the Thirty-nine Articles, such as might be suitable for the use of the American Methodist Church, which was founded in 1784. In that year these Articles were first printed as part of the original Methodist Service-Book, prepared by Wesley’s own hand. The first edition of this volume was published in America in 1784; and in 1786 and 1788, respectively, two editions were published for this country. It contained an abridgment of the Sunday Service of the Church of England, which has been adopted for use in a few Methodist Chapels in England, more perhaps in the country than in London; and for many years it was the authorized Methodist book for use in sacramental administration and other occasional Church offices. In the latter capacity, however, it has long been generally superseded by successive editions of the Conference Book of Offices. It is now likely to be wholly set aside by this new Church Service-Book, of which it may be regarded as, in a sense, the original.

An Appendix is added to the volume, containing Legal Directions relative to the Solemnization of Marriages in Wesleyan Chapels and the Burial Laws Amendment Act of 1880. Methodism has thus a complete Service-Book, and in regard to all Church responsibilities and all pastoral functions, is now, everywhere and in every way, an independent and fully organized communion. This Service-Book, itself, is equivalent to a manifesto that Wesleyan Methodism takes its place as a truly characteristic Evangelical Church, holding its own among the different churches of the Empire, and in presence of its own Mother Church—the Established Church of England—towards

which it has no wishes, except for its true prosperity, resting on the sure foundations of evangelical truth and life.

We noted as one of the defects of the Office for the Baptism of Infants in the Prayer-Book, that it ignored the part and responsibility of the parents in the baptismal rite and covenant. That defect, originally inherited from the Prayer-Book, has been supplied in the revised Baptismal form which was finally adopted by the Wesleyan Conference at Leeds last year. There were not a few in that Conference who regretted the loss, occasioned by the revision, of sacred words and of hallowed phrases which were enshrined in their memory, and identified with some of their dearest and deepest feelings. The large majority, however, of the Conference, approved of the changes proposed by the revisers, and if not absolutely all, certainly an immense majority, welcomed warmly the passages which emphasize the parent's place and part in the baptismal covenant, and the responsibilities belonging thereto. Indeed, it would be difficult to imagine that any Christian man or woman could fail heartily to approve and respond to the prayer introduced into the opening address to the congregation, that "the Holy Spirit may be given to this child, and also to his parents, who here present him in this holy sacrament, that they may be enabled to fulfil the solemn covenant into which they are now entering; so that this child, being sheltered from the dangers and temptations of the world, kept safe from ungodly teaching and example, and brought up in the nurture and admonition of the Lord, may be led to trust in Christ his Saviour, and may abide through life a faithful member of His holy Church." Nor can it be supposed that any could be found to disapprove the express and distinct prayer for the parents, inserted for the first time in this Baptismal formulary, as follows:—"O merciful God and heavenly Father, be pleased to give thy Holy Spirit to the parents of this infant, that they may have wisdom and grace to bring up their offspring in the nurture and admonition of the Lord, and in the faith of thy Holy Word; through Jesus Christ, our only Mediator and Redeemer." In the series of brief petitions, to which the standing congregation respond *Amen*, which in the Book of Common Prayer immediately precede the act of baptism, but which in this Wesleyan revised form,

immediately follow it, there is also inserted a petitionary sentence as follows :—"Grant that the parents of this infant may have grace, that they may ever set before their child the example of a godly life, and by their prayers and holy conversation may be the ministers of God to him for good."

Such is a general description of the full Service-Book, but we have intimated that the order of sacramental administration and the occasional services, together with the appendix—all, in short, besides the morning liturgical services—are printed not only in the Service-Book of which we have spoken, but by themselves as a separate Book of Offices. It is necessary to add, lest there should be any misconception as to what the actual living Methodist Church is, that the great demand in the Connexion will be for the small book, not for the large. Wesley's City Road and Bristol Church model has not been reproduced over the Connexion at large, for reasons which we will briefly explain, but which those who desire fully to understand will find explained and illustrated in detail in a small and cheap volume to which we have before referred, entitled, "John Wesley, the Church of England, and Wesleyan Methodism."

John Wesley, during his later years, maintained his own model service at the City Road Chapel, which Methodists have been much in the habit of speaking of as "the cathedral" of Methodism. But the full Church service and the complete ecclesiastical provisions of City Road could no more be maintained throughout the scattered circuits of country Methodism, with their village chapels, than the cathedral service of St. Paul's could be maintained in rustic village churches. It was a combination of special causes not elsewhere to be found which made the Methodism of London and Bristol take the form it did, with its full Church service, almost from the beginning, maintained during church hours in the Methodist meeting-house. One cause was that the number of converts, all of whom of course made it a point of conscience to attend the Sacrament at the Lord's Table, was in these two centres exceptionally large; a second was that the clergy combined, with resolute bigotry, to drive them from the Lord's Table; a third was that the Wesleys, dividing the benefit of their presence very largely between these two centres, and sometimes helped

by sympathizing clergymen, were able themselves at London and Bristol to administer the Sacraments to their people. Nowhere else did these three conditions thus concur. Elsewhere the Methodists, for the most part, had no resort open to them for the reception of the sacraments but the parish church. True, elsewhere also they were sometimes driven from the holy table. But still they had no means of keeping up a separate sacramental service of their own. The parish church was of necessity still their ecclesiastical centre. The consequence was that their own services were brief, homely, in their character supplementary, and for many years held out of church hours. The clergy, however, took no pains to win them. Speaking generally, they treated them with neglect and aversion, or even worse than so. The consequence was that the country Methodists very commonly grew up to dislike equally the clergy and the churches. They never attended church when they could help it. They wearied for the time to come when they could receive the sacraments either from Mr. Wesley or his brother, when now and then one of the brothers came round to see them, or from Dr. Coke, his helper, or in Wesley's latest years, from such of their own preachers as Wesley had authorized and appointed to administer the sacraments ; and when finally, after Wesley's death, the claim they had so long urged for the reception of the sacraments from their own preachers was conceded, they kept their own simple services and added to them the sacraments. Their preachers became ministers and pastors, but no liturgical forms were adopted in their worship. And for the most part the Church which had so long slighted or ill-used them remained to them, and to their children after them, a distasteful place, redolent of spiritual formalism and bigotry, and only by the sacred churchyard and its catholic solemnities hallowed to their thoughts. Such were the foundations laid a hundred years ago. And according to the beginning has been the after history ; according to the root has been the fruit. Traditions once firmly planted alike in place and race are scarcely ever to be dislodged. They continue to savour the spirit and feeling of the population for centuries.

Nor, indeed, was this quite the whole case. In Yorkshire the influence of Ingham, the itinerant evangelist, who married

a sister of Lord Huntingdon, was distinctly and strongly Dissenting, and leavened the West Riding population far and wide. In Lancashire, also, the influence of John Bennett, which extended far and was deeply rooted, was very strongly tingured with Dissenting principles. Besides which, several of Wesley's best preachers were Scotchmen, imbued with a decided Presbyterian bias. All these influences combined with the great main cause of which we have spoken; and country Methodism accordingly, both North and South, for the most part eschewed liturgical forms and whatever seemed to savour of the Church of England. It is almost a wonder that the sacramental services of Methodism remained Anglican in their character, and, indeed, at one time it seemed as if there was no little danger of these services being Presbyterianized. At this point, however, eventually the line was firmly drawn. In England the Wesleys and their famous helpers had themselves administered the Sacraments to the societies after the English form, even in towns and villages where they never preached to them in any church, or read prayers to them in any chapel or meeting-room. The English sacramental forms, accordingly, were sacred to English Methodists, and the Presbyterian modes of administration have been limited to Methodism in Scotland.

During the past century, indeed, the public services in country Methodist chapels have been not a little extended and enriched. The organ, the anthem, the chanted psalm, have been very generally introduced. The services are sweet, musical, and impressive. The Scripture lessons are unfailingly read. Sometimes, indeed, there is much solemnity and some stateliness about the worship, particularly on the Lord's Day. But very few country chapels have followed the example of City Road. In Bristol the tradition of Morning Service is still kept up, although not universally; so also in Bath and one or two other old seats of Methodism in the west and south of England the Liturgy is used. In Manchester, in Liverpool, even in the West Riding, there are instances, some of recent origin, of the use of the Liturgy in Wesleyan chapels. And it would not be wonderful, as the taste for ecclesiastical propriety and for refined and more or less ornate services spreads—and it is spreading in all Non-conformist communities—if there should, up to a certain limit,

be an increased use of the Morning Service. It is not unlikely, indeed, that the publication of this Service-Book may do something to promote such a movement, as it is certain that the want of such a book in the past has been unfavourable to any extension of the Liturgical use. But the limits within which such a movement is likely ever to extend are but narrow. In London the old customs will continue to be general. On the whole it suits London and its neighbourhood, except perhaps on the northern and eastern sides. And those who have been accustomed to it love it dearly. But alike in the manufacturing strongholds and the village homes of Methodist faith and worship the Service-Book, as a whole, will find little or no favour. In this respect John Wesley's ideal of Methodism will no more prevail generally in England than it has done in other parts of the world. For ourselves, we greatly prefer the complete Wesleyan Morning Service, and we love also to feel ourselves on the Sunday morning sharing in the old historical method of English worship, with its mingled lowliness and stateliness, with its tenderness and majesty—to feel ourselves, in such worship, united with untold generations of the past as well as with an ever-increasing volume of worshippers of the present. But we must be content, and more than content, that there should be varieties in our Church service; and, indeed, when in a full northern chapel, crowded with disciplined and devout Methodists who have inherited famous and sacred memories for a hundred years, we share the beauty and solemn joy of a Sunday morning's service—such singing!—such blended voices and gathered faces both of old and young!—the saintly old and the beaming crowded young—we can hardly maintain that such a service is in any way inferior to the best of London morning services.

Now it is for country Methodists, speaking generally, that the smaller book—which is, in fact, the Revised Book of Offices—will be in request. The larger volume will find its sale in London and in other places not numerous, but hardly to be called few, where the Morning Service is in use. Both contain all that is necessary for the sacramental and the solemn occasional services which gather around the Sunday worship of the “people called Methodists.”

---

## ART. IV.—REPUBLICAN FRANCE AND RELIGION.

FRANCE is a problem, often an enigma, to other nations. This is not to be wondered at, for she occasionally puzzles her own children, who anxiously ask what mysterious future she is approaching. It must be added that a chronic misunderstanding exists between France and England. The Channel which separates them is only a trench, over or under which locomotives will pass one day at full speed ; but the difference of race, character, education and religion make up so to speak, a moral channel of separation much larger and deeper, under which it will be very difficult to bore a tunnel. To these differences, arising from the nature of things, must be added others, which result from the foreign policy of the Jules Ferry Cabinet, and which we do not wish to mention at present. These recent grievances have somewhat embittered the feeling between the two countries, and added new elements of incompatibility to those above mentioned. Strange to say, the *entente cordiale*, which lasted so many years under the rule of Napoleon III., who seemed so unlikely to enlist the sympathies of a free nation,—that *entente cordiale* is seriously imperilled under the Republic,—that is to say, under a Government which, on close examination, very much resembles that which Great Britain has enjoyed for nearly two centuries. We have something better to do than to seek for the grounds of these misunderstandings and disagreements. Let us rather try to explain, as clearly as possible, the state of feeling and the *ensemble* of facts in France.

Certainly, one of the most difficult points of this position is the attitude of the third Republic towards religious questions. We wish, in a few pages, briefly to explain this attitude ; and we will try to bring to bear upon it a calm and impartial judgment, the judgment of a Frenchman attached by conviction to Liberal ideas, and who tries to unite them to an Evangelical faith. We hope these conditions of impartiality will suffice for English readers.

To thoroughly understand the politico-religious position of France, it is necessary to recall its chief historical features.

It would have been impossible for the French revolution not to enter, at an early stage, upon a struggle with the Romish Church. The latter had been the accomplice and often the instigator of the abuses of the old régime, and she opposed to all reforms such a resistance as threatened to overthrow the movement in favour of revolutionary change. The heads of the revolutionary movement, moreover, or some of them, were adepts of the infidel philosophy of the eighteenth century, and had little respect for an institution which they considered as a monument of the superstition of the Middle Ages. These two reasons are sufficient to explain the antagonism which, from 1789, was established between the Church and the Revolution, and which, in different phases, has lasted to the present day.

The Constituent Assembly, in which the clergy were strongly represented, declared to the end that it respected the Catholic religion, and yet did not hesitate to deal it some very heavy blows. By the emancipation of Protestants and Jews, it for ever broke up an odious monopoly; by the secularization of ecclesiastical property it deprived the Church of her immense wealth; by the suppression of religious congregations it deprived her of her most ardent helpers; by the civil constitution of the clergy it completely disorganized her. The last of these measures, brought about by the common efforts of the disciples of Rousseau and the Gallican Jansenists, was both a serious blow to religious liberty and a political fault, destined to bear bitter fruits. An assembly without a majority hostile to religion was thus compelled to enter into a struggle with Catholicism, and to inaugurate a period of conflict of which it is not even now possible to foretell the end.

In the Legislative Assembly, and especially in the Convention, opposition to Romanism turned to persecution. At first those priests who refused to take the oath (*nonjurors*) were exposed to the ill-treatment of the populace, and to annoyance from the authorities. But those who took the oath did not themselves escape the persecution, which finished by attacking all forms of religion. The priests were tracked, imprisoned, exiled, murdered.

"At the Paris Mairie (says Dr. de Pressensé\*) at the Abbaye, at La Force, at Saint Firmin, at Les Carmes, the priests were murdered *en masse*, and it was the same in the Provinces. At Rheims, amongst many other condemned priests, the Abbé Pacquot replied thus to those who urged him to take the oath: 'My choice is made, I prefer death to perjury; if I had two lives, I would give you one; but I have only one, and I keep it for God.' The refractory priests displayed, under these circumstances, the most noble courage, and refused, in view of the murderers' sword, to take an oath which would have saved their life against their conscience. Nothing in the history of the martyrs is more beautiful than the scene at Les Carmes; there was an emulation of holy heroism, blended with a pious tenderness. The venerable Archbishop of Arles, thanking God for having to offer himself up; the priests confessing each other and giving each other the kiss of peace before dying; the gentle and firm answers, worthy of the times of Irenæus; all these grand manifestations of a religion so recently discredited, illuminate the close of an unbelieving century with a truly celestial light, and reveal God with an extraordinary power at a time when an impious decree is about to endeavour to banish His worship."

During the rule of the Directoire religious liberty reappeared. The nation, to which had been offered in succession, by Chaumette, Atheism with the goddess Reason, and by Robespierre Deism with the worship of the Supreme Being (*Etre Suprême*), once delivered from her tyrants, returned of her own will to Christianity under its Roman Catholic form, the only one with which it was acquainted. Without official patronage or any payment from the State, the Church was re-organized in 45,000 parishes, and lived independent for several years. It was not, therefore, as so many historians have stated, Napoleon who raised again the altars, and revived Christian worship in France. The "Concordat" of 1801, a work of cunning and despotism, had no other aim than to link with chains Catholicism to the Imperial policy, and to force religion and the papacy to serve the ends of an ambitious genius.

Napoleon thought he had gained a great victory in extorting from the Pope, by threats and by cunning, his signature to the "Concordat," to which he added the organic articles which ensured the complete subjection of the Church to the civil power, and turned it into "a kind of sacred police," according to the naïve expression of an admirer of this act. The Romish

---

\* "L'Eglise et la Révolution Française," p. 244.

Church resigned herself to accept this contract, which enslaved her for a time, but permitted her nevertheless to hope for a return of political favour.

"At the time when the Concordat was drawn up (justly observes Lanfrey\*), Catholicism no longer existed as a political power; thanks to the position which it then regained, it was enabled again to take hold of the rising generation, and prepare those long and fatal internal commotions, during which ultramontane absolutism has imperilled all the conquests of modern thought. The Abbé de Pradt declared he had often heard Napoleon say that 'the Concordat was the greatest fault of his reign.' "

The restoration of the Bourbons, whilst maintaining the Concordat, restored to the clergy the political authority of which Napoleon had deprived them. Catholicism became a political party, the most noisy and arrogant of all, because the King was with it. But it raised against him the antipathies and opposition of all who were unwilling to go back to 1789. The momentary triumph of the Jesuits evoked a complete tempest against them, and their final attempt to regain power under the Polignac Ministry brought about the fall of the Bourbons in 1830. France showed by a decisive experience that, even though she might respect the spiritual authority of the clergy, she meant to tolerate no longer their interference in the government of the nation.

The reign of Louis Philippe was an era of religious tranquillity. The Catholic party, without concealing its dislike to the Orleanist monarchy, understood that it had itself much to be forgiven, and did not interfere too openly with politics. The Government, on its side, wished, above all else, to avoid religious quarrels; and this was the principle which led M. Guizot, although a Protestant by conviction, to make unexpected concessions to the Catholic party, and to declare that the foreign policy of France ought to be a Catholic policy. The clergy eagerly welcomed these declarations, and applauded the acts which followed them (such as the Tahiti affair); but these advances did not reconcile them with the junior branch (the Orleanists), and they watched its downfall with undisguised satisfaction.

---

\* "History of Napoleon I.," vol. ii. p. 359.

The readiness with which the clergy blessed the trees of liberty which the Republicans of 1848 planted, might have given rise to the belief that they were converted to Liberal views. It was not so. A few Liberal Catholics, like Father Lacordaire, were evidently sincere in the joyful welcome they gave to the Republic. The rest looked upon it, from its birth, as an essentially provisional régime, a kind of bridge towards a state of things more in harmony with their hopes. They had no occasion to complain of the Republic; during its short duration it gave them what they had in vain demanded from preceding Governments, a law which allowed them to establish colleges in rivalry with those of the State. The Catholic party, thus favoured by the Republic of 1848, remained none the less in a constant state of conspiracy against it, and never ceased expecting and preparing for the return of the Bourbons.

Instead of a Bourbon it was a Bonaparte who overturned the Republic and put himself in its place. After the first shock of surprise, a large majority of the Catholic party performed an evolution, and welcomed the rising sun. The clergy chanted *Te Deums* for the re-establishment of the Empire, and settled on the steps of the new imperial throne. Napoleon III. rewarded this ardour by conferring upon them privileges and dignities, but without allowing them, however, to assume the political ascendancy to which they aspired. Faithful to Napoleonic tradition, he rather made use of the Catholic clergy than served them. He did not even fear to displease and to irritate them, when the interests of politics or of his dynasty appeared to require it. This was especially the case in the Italian question, the solution of which so greatly wounded the Catholic party, and drove a number over to the opposition. It seems highly probable that the desire to restore to the Empire the sympathies and the support of the clergy was one of the decisive causes of the foolish Franco-Prussian war. As he grew old the Emperor fell more completely under the influence of his wife, whilst she fell under the undivided influence of the priests. She had said: "This war shall be *my* war!" And what her cassocked advisers wished, in exciting this war, was doubtless to break down a Protestant power, but especially to bring about a general revolution, which should

give the preponderance of political power to the Papacy and to Catholicism. Every one knows how these calculations were foiled by the course of events.

To sum up, since the Revolution, French Catholicism has followed up ceaselessly the chimera of the re-establishment of its ancient privileges and of its political preponderance. To attain this, it has formed itself into a party, chiefly known by the name of Ultramontanism. This party has become more and more consolidated. For forty years it has had for its chief organ a fighting newspaper, the *Univers*, the editor-in-chief of which, Louis Veuillot, lately deceased, was its eminent and unscrupulous leader. Its one principle is: "Everything for the Pope! The Pope before everything!" The Syllabus is its only charter. The Council of the Vatican has given to its doctrines the most marked approval, and imposed silence on all liberal dissent. Henceforth there is no authentic and recognized Catholicism but that which was avouched in Rome at the time when the Empire fell to pieces at Sedan.

Such is the situation which the Third Republic has inherited from its birth. Like its predecessor of 1848, it first appeared favourable to the views of the clergy. The National Assembly of 1871 found itself with a majority composed of Catholic Monarchists. There were several reasons for this. The popularity of the Republican party had suffered a momentary eclipse, resulting from the reverses of a war for which it was not responsible, but which it persisted in continuing, while public opinion longed for peace. The greater number of the Royalist deputies were chosen on account of their pacific opinions, their respectability, and their patriotic conduct. The mission intrusted to them was not to change the form of government, but to make peace and to reorganize the country.

The Monarchist majority of the Assembly was not slow to reveal its clerical tendencies. At a time when the ashes of the Paris monuments had hardly cooled down, and when German troops still occupied French territory, it discussed the best means of interfering in favour of the temporal power of the Pope, and encouraged in the country a dangerous agitation on this question. But it was especially after the 24th of May,

1873, when M. Thiers had been replaced by Marshal MacMahon, that a decidedly Ultramontane reaction took place. One hundred and fifty deputies went on a pilgrimage to Chartres to worship a Druidical stone and a black virgin, and to thank Heaven for the overthrow of M. Thiers. The Assembly approved of the construction of the Basilica of the Sacred Heart at Paris, built with the avowed purpose of consecrating France to this new worship, invented in the last century by a poor mad girl, Marie Alacoque. It sanctioned an order of the Prefect of Lyons which compelled civil interments to take place at six o'clock in the morning. It passed a law on military chaplains, which installed priests in the barracks, and other laws relating to public instruction and higher education, which were suggested by the Bishop of Orleans, M. Dupanloup, and which opposed compulsory education, so long claimed by public opinion, and gave the clergy the right of founding universities and granting scholastic titles. In different parts of France pilgrimages were organized to prepare the downfall of the Republic and the accession of the legitimate King, who was to re-establish Catholicism as a State religion, to restore the old régime, and to efface every trace of the Revolution of 1789. Thousands of pilgrims went to Lourdes, to La Salette, and to Paray-le-Monial, singing the famous hymn—

“Sauvez Rome et la France,  
Au nom du Sacré-Cœur.”

“Save Rome and France,  
In the name of the Sacred Heart.”

and uttering the seditious cry of “Vive Henri V.!”

It is well known that the Comte de Chambord caused the failure of this attempted restoration by refusing to make any concession in regard to the white flag. If this defeat greatly rejoiced all who had the moral greatness of France at heart, it could not make them forget that all the Liberal conquests of a century had nearly been lost by the cleverly-woven plot of the Catholic party. One must have experienced the anguish of those weeks during which the victory of the reaction seemed secure, to understand the anger of Liberal France against those who had all but replaced her under the yoke.

But it was chiefly the *Coup d'Etat* of the 16th of May, 1877, which most exasperated public opinion against the clerical party, and impressed on French politics the character which it has had ever since. It will be remembered under what circumstances this audacious attempt was made. The elections of 1876 had been a humiliating defeat for ultramontanism. It had tried to move the masses by stirring sermons and triumphant pilgrimages; use was made of religious assemblies and episcopal charges to persuade the electors that they ought to vote for the partisans of the Syllabus. The peasants of the provinces, not less than the labouring classes in the towns, turned a deaf ear, and returned to the Chamber men who were devoted to Republican institutions. The clerical Republic of Messrs. de Broglie and Buffet was condemned without any chance of appeal.

The famous *Coup d'Etat* of the 16th of May was the final attempt of the clerical party to regain the power they had lost. The signal had been given from Rome, in the papal speech of the 16th of March, 1877, by which Pius IX. requested the bishops to exert their influence over their respective governments in favour of the oppressed Holy See. Catholic agitation in France became intense; petitions were signed claiming the re-establishment of the temporal power; the bishops published charges which were threatening to the Italians. The Cabinet of M. Jules Simon protested against this agitation, and the Chamber of Deputies passed an order of the day, which declared that "the ultramontane manifestations might compromise the external and internal security of the country," and, in order to suppress this disloyal agitation, called upon the Government to put into force the existing laws against such movements. A few days after this, Marshal MacMahon, with military unceremoniousness, dismissed the Jules Simon Ministry, entrusted to M. de Broglie the task of forming a new Cabinet, and dissolved the Chamber. Public opinion was not deceived as to the origin and import of this crisis; it was regarded as an act of retaliation on the part of the Catholic party, and the Ministry of aggression just appointed received the name of *Gouvernement des Curés* (the Clerical Government).

We shall not describe here the six months' crisis during

which the reactionary party gathered all its strength to win the elections. The clergy threw themselves into the contest with imprudent impetuosity; the bishops lavished their praises on the authors of the *Coup d'Etat*, and the priests became electioneering agents from one end of the country to the other. The defeat of the party was startling; but by this result the clergy especially were brought into discredit and contempt. In this contest they were the chief losers, and their attitude justified only too strongly the celebrated saying of Gambetta: "Clericalism is the enemy!" This last campaign was the unfortunate crowning of a long series of ill-advised interferences with politics. Catholicism had shown itself the irreconcilable enemy of the Liberal aspirations and Republican institutions of France. It was in the nature of things that the triumph of the Republic should signalize the beginning of a contest with the clerical party. In fact, this contest has been the chief feature of the home policy of France during the years which have followed.

Religious *congregations* (orders) were first attacked. In framing a law for higher education, M. Jules Ferry, Minister of Public Instruction, inserted a seventh article, which stipulated that "no one belonging to an unauthorized *congregation* (or religious order) shall be allowed to take part in public or free instruction, nor to conduct an institution for teaching of any kind whatsoever." This clause especially aimed at the Jesuits, who possessed in France numerous establishments where young people were taught to detest the Liberal institutions of their country. In attacking thus the teaching congregations, the Minister touched the apple of the eye of the Romish Church; he therefore stirred up universal and unanimous indignation in the ultramontane camp. Some protests were also heard from the Liberal party. It was said, and not without reason, that the Article VII. pledged the Republic to an anti-liberal course of conduct, and that to refuse permission to teach to certain men, furnished with the diplomas required by law, for the sole reason that they belonged to a religious order, was to infringe on their rights as citizens.

The seventh article having been thrown out by the Senate

the Government, as it had announced, had recourse, to attain the same ends, to "existing laws," viz., the decrees of March 29, 1880. One of these declared that the establishments belonging to the Society of Jesus were to be closed in three months' time; and the second granted to the non-authorized congregations three months in which to put themselves in order by requesting legal recognition. There were in France 7,444 monks belonging to unauthorized orders, and forming 385 establishments. Of this number 1,541 were Jesuits, forming sixty houses, twenty-six of which possessed a college or a school. The monks to whom the decrees referred refused to take any steps towards their recognition, and were expelled from their establishments *manu militari*. In these expulsions some painful scenes took place. The monks, following the advice of their lay friends, feigned a resistance, which could only bring ridicule on their cause, without serving it in any way. The excitement was, moreover, of short duration, and quite local. A Frenchman, even when favourable to religious ideas, does not usually like monks, and those who expected a show of opinion in their favour were disappointed. The Government has not yet thought it necessary to disperse the non-authorized orders of nuns, who have in France 826 communities and 14,000 members.

The satisfaction thus given to anti-clerical hatred leaves still open so many houses that one may be allowed to doubt its efficacy. Besides which, the colleges of the Jesuits are everywhere carried on under the direction of secular priests or of ultramontane laymen, and the number of their pupils has not diminished. In this business the Government has only incurred the odium of persecution, without having profited by it.

The war with Romanism has chiefly been continued on the battle-field of public instruction. The new law on higher education has deprived the Catholic institutions of the title of Universities, and, what has been felt more than anything else, has taken away from them the right to confer degrees. In the matter of primary instruction, the changes have been far more important, and the struggle has been unusually keen and sometimes rabid.

The public schools established in each commune or parish by the law of 1833 (of which the honour belongs to M. Guizot) were of a denominational character—that is to say, they were Catholic, except where the number of Protestants (or Jews) was sufficiently large for them to have a school of their own. Priests were admitted in the local committee of supervision, members of the teaching religious orders could be appointed to conduct the schools, and this was very largely done; the teacher was obliged to give religious instruction, and to hear his pupils repeat the catechism. Very often the teacher was dependent on the priest in a humiliating degree, and the school was an appendage of the Church. The congreganists, who, being unmarried, could be content with a smaller salary than lay teachers, superseded them more and more, and many communes gave them the preference for economy's sake. The instruction which they gave was generally very insufficient, and that is easily accounted for, when it is remembered that a large number, especially amongst the nuns, had not the *brevet de capacité* (diploma) required from lay teachers, but only a certificate signed by a bishop, and called *lettre d'obédience*.

The Republic could not accept a state of things which was so evidently calculated to favour Romanism. It began by suppressing the *lettres d'obédience*; then it undertook the great revolution long before inscribed on the Republican programme: the school gratuitous, compulsory, and secular (*laïque*).

Gratuitous public instruction has appeared in France to be the necessary corollary of compulsion. The feeling of equality, so dear to the French, would not have accepted of a gratuity only offered to the poor. It is true that this principle involved great expense. The Republic has considered it a point of honour not to be niggardly in this matter. The budget of public instruction, which was 1,500,000 francs (£60,000) in 1833 rose this year (1883) to 90,784,811 francs (£3,635,392).

Compulsory education has been strongly objected to by the Catholic party, which has set up in opposition the liberty of heads of families. But the great battle was fought on the question of the lay character to be given to the schools. It seems difficult to impose as a law the compulsory character

of the teaching, without establishing as a corollary the religious neutrality of the school.

"It has seemed to us necessary (says M. Paul Bert) to promise to heads of families that nothing shall be taught in these schools which could interfere with their own liberty of conscience and that of their children. How could you condemn a father who would say, 'Being a Protestant, I will not send my child to the Catholic school, the only one there is in my commune; I do not wish it, because he will receive there Catholic instruction'?"

The law of 1850 had pretended to satisfy the conscience of religious minorities, by granting them separate schools, but, in reality, out of 1369 communes where Protestant churches have public worship, only 384 had a Protestant school. And we are bound to say that in Catholic schools Protestant children were generally treated as if infested with the plague if they refused to join in the religious practices of their schoolfellows. It is not therefore from the Protestant side that the objections to this reform have arisen. But from the Catholic side the protests have been warm and indignant. The Republican government has been reproached with wishing to found a school without God, an atheistic school. To give satisfaction to the complainants, M. Jules Simon and his friends wished the new law to mention expressly amongst the subjects of instruction "the duties towards God." The Senate had agreed to this amendment, but, in view of the refusal of the Chamber of Deputies, it consented to reverse its vote, and to strike out all mention of "duties towards God."

We could have wished that since the state of feeling in France requires religious neutrality in the schools, the teaching of ethics had been equally struck off the programme. What, indeed, are ethics independent of religion—ethics which are not connected with God as their source, and a future life as their sanction? Official ethics—a subject which figures on the programme of the Government normal schools—includes, we admit, God and a future life. But we have no guarantee that the State which to-day favours Deism, will not in a few years prefer Atheism. After having requested its teachers to speak of God to their pupils, could it not order

them to put away the idea of God as a useless hypothesis? The day when M. Paul Bert should succeed M. Jules Ferry in the Cabinet, we should be in danger of seeing Positivism take the place of Deism in the programmes of public instruction. There was only one way of avoiding this peril—namely, to strike out ethics as well as religion, from the programmes of primary schools, and to leave the care of providing this twofold teaching to families, to priests, and to pastors. This point of view has been defended with talent by Pastor Bersier, in a pamphlet which has met with great success. The Chambers, however, have not adopted it, and difficulties have resulted of which we do not yet see the end.

Many Liberal writers have been eager to draw up manuals of ethics for the use of primary schools, in accordance with the new law. Some of these books are very well written, and make morality rest on faith in God and a future life. But they have none the less been denounced by the Bishops to the Congregation of the Index, which has forbidden the Catholics to read or to use them. From this a conflict has resulted, which is still exceedingly bitter. The Bishops have hastened to promulgate in their dioceses the decree of the Roman See, accompanying it with the most irritating comments. Immediately the Government, making use of the right conferred on it by the Concordat, summoned the Bishops before the Council of State, for having published without its consent a declaration emanating from the Holy See. The *curés* and parish priests have of course acted in conformity with the orders received from Rome through their Bishops, and have zealously hunted up the prohibited manuals, threatening with the spiritual penalties at their disposal the children who used them, and refusing to admit them to confirmation. The Government has had recourse to the only punishment in its power in order to reach the priests most compromised by the violence of their resistance,—it has stopped their salary. One can imagine how many protestations this has occasioned in the Catholic camp. This state of things has not changed at the present time, and it is not easy to see how it will end. The *appel comme d'abus*, the only penalty the Council of State can inflict on the Bishops, is but a light censure, which has never greatly disturbed the members of the Episco-

pate. As to the suspension of salary which the Concordat permits to be pronounced against a simple priest, it cannot seriously fetter a Church which disposes of large pecuniary resources. It would take a long time to enumerate all the other Bills which have been, or are about to be, adopted in the French Chambers, with a view to put a stop to the successive encroachments of the Romish Church. Some aim at protecting the conscience of non-Catholics; for instance, the proposed Bills for the suppression of chaplains in barracks and hospitals, for the liberty of the cemeteries, for the suppression of the laws enforcing a cessation of labour on Sundays and fête days, for the omission of judicial oaths, for the removal of crucifixes from the law courts; for the repeal of the law which compels soldiers to attend divine service in a church to which they do not belong. Some of these laws are doubtless open to criticism, and show an anti-religious prejudice we cannot but condemn. Nevertheless, their general tendency is to respect the individual conscience, and to put an end to the fiction, so long maintained, that France is a Catholic country. The same consideration more or less justifies various police and administrative measures which have roused strong protests from the Catholic party—such as, for instance, the prohibitions, in many places, of processions which, on certain fête days, monopolized the streets, and obliged the passers-by to perform outward signs of respect which were often in opposition to their convictions.

The most difficult problem which the Republican policy will have to solve, in a very near future, is that of the attitude to be taken with reference to the *Concordat*. The Catholic Church desires it to be maintained because the experience of the past has taught her that, if this treaty imposes upon her rather troublesome fetters, yet, on the whole, it confers an official standing which has its advantages. On this question the Republican party is divided. The Opportunist section, of which Gambetta was the leader while he lived, wishes to continue the Concordat as an instrument of restraint over the clergy and of power in the hands of the State. The Liberal and the Radical sections, on the contrary, are agreed in desiring the abolition of the Concordat; the first, because they believe that the complete separation of the Church from the State

would be the only liberal and fair solution of the question; the latter, because they think that, stripped of the prestige which it derives from its union with the State, the Romish Church would be condemned to a rapid downfall.

Numerous Bills have been presented within the last few years for the repeal of the Concordat. The two principal ones are due to Messrs. Boysset and Jules Roche. Both aim at separating the Church from the State and abolishing the budget of public worship; but they are not sustained by a majority of the Chamber of Deputies, and have no chance of being adopted for some time. We may judge of the intense animosity against the Romish Church which has inspired these bills by the following extracts from the *Exposé des Motifs* (Statement of Principles) of M. Boysset:—"We, the Republic of 1881, are not in any manner the heirs of Napoleon Bonaparte, and we cannot be bound by a treaty which he has signed. The French Republic cannot any longer, by her millions and her official influence, sustain her declared enemies."

The other fraction of the Republican party wishes, on the contrary, to keep up the Concordat, in order to make it an *instrumentum regni*. The Bill of M. Paul Bert (7th of February, 1882), inspired by Gambetta, would enforce the strict observance of the Concordat by giving a penal sanction to the prescriptions it contains. It stipulates that every priest who shall have incurred a "*déclaration d'abus*," may be deprived of his salary. The publication, without authorization, of the decisions of the Papal See would be punished by a fine of 500 to 1,000 francs. M. Paul Bert, as well as M. Jules Roche, asks that the salaries of the members of the clergy be reduced, as far as possible, to what they were when the Concordat was originally agreed upon between Napoleon I. and the Pope. According to the latter of these deputies, this would diminish the Budget of Public Worship by fifty-three to fifty-four millions of francs.

It is this proposal for a strict observance of the Concordat which appears to-day to command the general approval of the lawgivers of France. Every year the vote of the Budget of Worship brings back the long procession of the economies which might be realized on various points. The Government

already applies to refractory priests the remedy of forfeiting their salaries. It is seriously proposed to deprive the Catholic Church of the enjoyments of landed estates and buildings, worth at least sixty millions, which are appropriated to uses not rendered obligatory by the Concordat.

What must be thought of the various measures, of which we have given an incomplete but monotonous enumeration, and of the anti-clerical policy which they express? We will close this paper by a short answer to this question.

The partisans of these restrictive measures urge two principles to justify them. The first is, the necessity of protecting the moral unity of France; and the second, the duty of respecting the conscience of non-Catholics.

This last idea is new in French legislation, and it certainly deserves praise. The Protestants, especially, have had much to suffer from the haughtiness and the encroachments of Catholicism, which, since it was unable to persecute them any longer, has not spared them any kind of annoyances and molestation. They cannot, therefore, be moved with much pity towards those who now declare themselves oppressed because an effort is made to bring them back to common law. Moreover, besides the Protestants and the Jews, there are in France multitudes of men who are no longer connected with Romanism, and whose convictions must be respected. One cannot, therefore, refuse to approve what aims at taking away from Catholicism its privileged position, and bringing it back under the empire of the common law.

We are not so satisfied in reference to the other principle invoked by the partisans of the anti-clerical policy. They say they wish to secure the moral unity of France. The danger they wish to avoid strikes us also. We are threatened with having two Frances, separated each from the other by a contradictory education, and by widely different principles and interests. The opposition is already manifest in many families, between the wife, educated by the priests in all the practices of Romish superstition, and the husband, a freethinker and a disciple of Voltaire. But whilst we do not wish to ignore the danger which threatens the Latin races on this account, we do not admit that it is the business of the State to remove it. Let

the State watch over the national unity, the unity of legislation and of language—that is enough. The danger resulting from its intermeddling in moral and religious divisions would be more to be feared than the divisions themselves. The claim of the State to re-establish the moral unity of the nation is not a new one in France. It was the claim of Louis XIV., when he repealed the Edict of Nantes, and we know what have been the lamentable results of this revocation. Let us not forget that such pretensions lead to persecution. The intervention of the State in this domain provokes resistance, and resistance in its turn calls forth repression.

When such measures undertake to regulate creeds they are necessarily powerless. The religious conscience, even when it has been misled, will not endure violence, and always ends by retaliation. So long as the French Government is content with bringing back Catholicism within the limits of obedience to the laws, it will hold an impregnable position, and be sustained by public opinion. But if it begin to persecute, public opinion will turn against it.

It may be asked, for instance, whether the decrees against the Congregations have not overshot the mark. At all events, they have been useless. The *Syllabus* was the doctrine not only of the Orders which have been suppressed, but also of those which have remained undisturbed in France, and of the secular clergy themselves.

"Have we not in France," says M. Jules Simon, in a recent volume,\* "authorized congregations, which devote themselves to primary teaching, who possess a 'personnel' of 20,341 brethren, distributed in 3,096 schools, of which 2,328 are public schools, besides 16,478 girls' schools, conducted by nuns belonging to authorized congregations? And is not the *Syllabus* obeyed in these 19,574 boys' and girls' schools? How is it, if the *Syllabus* threatens you so, that you do not close these seventy-thousand primary schools, these numerous colleges and seminaries, the teaching of which, it is undeniable, differs only in its methods from that of the Jesuits?"

The French Government is therefore in presence of the following dilemma: Either it will continue to the end in the way it has entered, and will incur—though it professes to be a Liberal régime—the reproach of persecuting a numerous and important

---

\* "Dieu, Patrie, Liberté," p. 254.

section of the nation ; or else it will only take half measures, and then its work will be useless, for it will have excited some of the worst passions without really disarming the Catholic party.

In our opinion there is only one possible method of escaping from this dilemma—namely, the adoption of a truly Liberal policy, which, respecting the rights of all, would require from all obedience to the laws, and would submit every one to the common law. This policy, which will certainly prevail one day, will bring about, as a necessary consequence, but without violence or wrong-doing, the separation of the Church and State. In France the Church, it must be remembered, is directly paid and salaried by the State out of the taxes, and appears yearly before the Chamber to have its special budget criticised. The contrast, in this respect, between the relations of Church and State in England and in France is one never to be lost sight of, and which greatly aggravates the French dilemma, as it has now been explained.

---

ART. V.—THE OFFICIAL YEAR-BOOK OF THE  
CHURCH OF ENGLAND.

*The Official Year-Book of the Church of England.* London :  
Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge. 1883.

INFORMATION respecting this volume will not be unacceptable to our readers ; and to few of them, if to any, can such information fail to be useful as well as interesting. We propose to avail ourselves of the help which the "Official Year-Book" affords, in endeavouring to indicate the work of the Church of England.

Many questions of interest and of importance will not be touched in this article. It will not attempt to discuss the form or system of the government and constitution of the Church of England. The consideration of whether Episcopacy, Presbyterianism, or Congregationalism is most in accord with

[No. CXXI.]—NEW SERIES, VOL. I. NO. I.

F

Christian standards and the facts of Church history, does not lie within the purpose of this paper. So, with respect to such other subjects as these—whether the quality and aim of Church of England effort, in the pulpit and out of it, are always as high and good as they might be; and whether disestablishment and disendowment, one or both, be expedient, right, or practicable—for the present, at all events, they are passed by. It is impossible to be unaware of the importance of such subjects, and the temptation to write about them is not small, but we resist it. Our silence, however, respecting these and kindred questions must not be misconstrued as implying carelessness respecting them. A very different reason compels us to keep as far as possible within the limits we have indicated.

In dealing with our subject it seems, however, necessary to reply in the first place to a question which the title of the volume named at the head of this article is not unlikely to suggest—namely, what is “the Church of England?”

It includes, of course, both the clergy—who are its most prominent officers—and the laity—who form its bulk, and for whose sake mainly it exists.

As an ecclesiastical institution, it is essentially episcopal; its government being conducted by bishops. Each archbishop superintends the conduct of the bishops in his province, whether of Canterbury or of York, and within his own special diocese he exercises episcopal authority. For the purposes of episcopal administration, England and Wales are divided into thirty-one dioceses, four of which—namely, Liverpool, Newcastle, St. Albans, and Truro—have been recently created (two others, Southwell and Wakefield, are contemplated). The Archbishop of Canterbury is assisted by the Bishop Suffragan of Dover; the Bishop of London is helped by the Bishop Suffragan of Bedford, and also by an assistant bishop; the Bishop of Lincoln by the Bishop Suffragan of Nottingham; the Bishop of Peterborough by an assistant bishop; and the Bishop of St. Albans by the Bishop Suffragan of Colchester. It may be well to explain that each of the “suffragan” Bishops referred to has been consecrated for the assistance of the Bishop of the See in connection with which he is named, and his prescribed work is

in a particular portion of the diocese of that Bishop. In his relation to the archbishop (his superior), every bishop is a suffragan. In each diocese there are other dignitaries and officers, who, however, are much more numerous in some dioceses than in others. For example, no one of the four new dioceses has a dean or canons of its own; and while the "Year-Book" supplies the names and designations of *thirty-two* officials for the diocese of Canterbury, counting from the dean downwards, it records only *seven* such names of officials for the Newcastle diocese. In all the older dioceses there are, together with archdeacons and other officials, a dean and canons. At one time each diocese had several deans, being subdivided into deaneries, each of which consisted of ten parishes. Hence, probably, the origin of the title; since each dean, or *decanus*, was over the ten parishes. The dean in a diocese is the president of the chapter, and is the ecclesiastical superior of its canons and prebendaries. The canons, as the foregoing sentence implies, are, with other clergy, members of the cathedral chapter or bishop's council, and each of them, unless he be "honorary," enjoys a prebend, or revenue, which is allotted to him chiefly for the performance of divine service in the cathedral church. The archdeacons—who, as ecclesiastical dignitaries, rank next to bishops, and are usually appointed by them—exercise allotted jurisdictions within the diocese, subject always to the bishop. Their jurisdiction, however, has little of the reality of power or of the force of law. It is not much more than conventional. Within each diocese there are the ordinary clergy, who are either (a) rectors—each of whom has charge of a parish and its parsonage, and has right to the (rectorial) tithes, greater and smaller—or (b) vicars, who differ from rectors in this, that they receive the smaller tithes only, or salaries paid to them by the chapter or by laymen, who have become owners of the prædial or landed tithes; or (c) curates—stipendiary (paid and removable), or perpetual\* (not removable)—each of whom is licensed by the bishop, and each temporary or stipendiary curate is

---

\* These perpetual curacies have, however, during the last few years been designated "vicarages," and ministers of District Churches have been styled "rectors."

usually employed to assist the incumbent or parson in performing divine service in the church, and in discharging various other duties of the parish outside the church.

The term "parish," which does constant service as the designation of a defined portion of the country marked out for the purposes of local government, is here used in its ecclesiastical application. So regarded, each parish has its own lay ecclesiastical officers. These include churchwardens, of whom there are usually two, one being appointed by the minister and the other by the parishioners. The churchwardens' duties, for the discharge of which they have corporate powers, comprise—among other things—the superintendence of church property; and the enforcement of appropriate behaviour during divine service.

Such in outline and generally is the official organization of "the Church of England," so called, with historical propriety; but besides this phrase, quoted from the title of the "Official Year-Book," there is the familiar, and more extended one, "the Church of England by law established," which it may be well to explain.

One idea commonly, and so far not incorrectly, associated with the words, "by law established," is that the Church of England is a religious body, having "by law" obligations and privileges which differ from those of other religious bodies which are not "established;" but this was no part of the original meaning of the phrase. As it is now commonly understood, it is associated with, and it implies and fosters, certain erroneous notions—namely, these, that there was some precise and particular period when the State of England determined to confer certain privileges upon a religious body called the Church of England; that this religious body was so privileged by the State rather than, and instead of, some other religious body on which it might have preferred to confer the privileges referred to; that a bargain or compact was at that precise period made between the two parties of Church and State, in pursuance of which the Church of England, in view of specified privileges to be conferred, undertook to accept certain obligations and restraints to be imposed; and that this conferring of privileges on the one hand, and this acceptance of obligations and restraints on the other hand, formed a compact or bargain

which was, or was an essential condition of, the establishment by law of the Church of England.

But, in truth, the Church of England never was so established by a formal and deliberate act of the Legislature, and no bargain or compact was ever made between the two parties of the Church and the State. It was impossible that any such compact could have been entered into during the pre-Reformation period, because the Church was the nation, and the State was also the nation; and it could not be that the nation should bargain with itself. The nation in one aspect of itself was the State, and in another was the Church, the Church having grown up in strict identity with the nation from the beginning, regulated from time to time, but never constituted by, Act of Parliament. The Church accordingly is described as established, because at the foundation of its Church rights and Church order lay the immemorial common law of the land, and because on this basis, from time to time, the nation legislated for the regulation of the Church, which was only itself under a special form. But this Church to-day is no longer the one Church of the land; it is still, however, specially recognized and privileged, and as such it is subject to special control, and it is under special obligation, but in what each of these consists needs not now to be specified. It is enough to say that the Church of England, as established, enjoys privileges which no other religious body in England enjoys, and that it is under obligations and control to which no other religious body is subject. To sum up, let us say that the Church of England is the creation of law in its general sense, both written and unwritten, but it is not the creation of any definite and particular law or laws. As an establishment it has *grown up*, after the manner of Parliament and the army; it has not been by any law *set up*. Like many other things in our English Commonwealth, it holds its present position as the result of a state of affairs which has ceased to exist. It is now one among, and in England it is the largest among, many religious bodies; but, in the period during which its original conditions of obligation and privilege grew up, it was the only religious body of the nation—it was the nation itself in the matter of religion. During a later period Roman-Catholics, Anglicans, and Puritans, in turn claimed and strove to be

the nation in a religious sense; and each did its best to establish itself in sole possession, to the exclusion of any other. No one of them dreamed of the present state of affairs as possible—namely, the co-existence of Churches not established with the Church “by law established.” Both Roman-Catholics and Puritans failed, under circumstances which need not be recited, to be or to represent the nation in its religious aspect, and therefore failed to be “by law established” as the Church of England is.

The “Official Year Book” is issued under the sanction of the principal dignitaries of the English, Irish, and Scottish Churches, and has been published “under the direction of a representative Committee, by the Tract Committee of the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge.” The object of the Committee in compiling the book is said, in its preface, to have been “to unfold and exhibit the work of the Church of England and of the Churches in communion with her, as far as it is possible to gather from time to time, the details of their labours.” The history of the book is stated to have been as follows:—

“In June, 1881, a preliminary meeting was held at Westminster for the purpose of taking into consideration the desirability of publishing year by year, in an authorized and complete form, the general results of the work of the Church. The decisions arrived at were submitted to an adjourned meeting held in the Chapter House of St. Paul’s . . . . when the following resolution was unanimously agreed to: ‘That an ecclesiastical year-book be published, giving in concise form the facts relating to the work of the Church of England in all its various branches.’ This resolution was subsequently amended, so that the book might comprehend the work of Churches in communion with the Church of England, and a committee was formed to carry out this determination.”

In subsequent paragraphs, the preface states the authority under which the book is issued and measures taken to secure trustworthy information; it also describes the arrangement of contents, recognizes services rendered in the compilation, and mentions that—

“While the committee has met with no discouragement nor any disposition to withhold information, there are several fields of labour which have not been touched upon, and subjects of general interest to the Church, which for various reasons have not this year been embraced.

Amongst these may be mentioned the records of the Eastern Church, the work of the Church in connection with the Army, Prisons, Hospitals, Sisterhoods, and Guilds, numerous Clergy Charities, and Endowment Funds."

The volume is a portly octavo, containing 800 pages, of which about 90 are taken up by advertisements. It is arranged in three parts: Part I. consists of Historical Records; Part II. of Statistical Records; and Part III. is a record of Officers and Societies of the Church.

Part I. contains twelve chapters distributed into sections. The subjects of the chapters are as follows:—Training for Holy Orders; the Home Mission Work of the Church; the Educational Work of the Church; the Foreign Mission Work of the Church; Increase of the Episcopate; Church Choral Associations; the Councils of the Church; Official Reports of Churches in Communion with the Church of England; Clergy Charities, Endowments, &c.; Ordinations—Preferments—Obituary; Chronological Record of Events; and Recent Church Literature. These chapters fill nearly 600 pages: under Parts II. and III. the sub-divisions are less numerous.

I. TRAINING FOR HOLY ORDERS.—Men ready to devote themselves to the work of the Church are not wanting, but many of these are unable to provide themselves with the requisite training. For the assistance of such men organizations exist, but they are neither numerous enough, nor sufficiently provided with funds. Five societies having this object are named in the Year Book; the annual income of each is not stated, but it does not seem to exceed an average of £1,000 per annum. Diocesan organizations in Canterbury, Exeter, Carlisle, and London, slightly supplement what is done by the five societies, but the London scheme is only tentative, and its results hitherto are extremely slender; in the others the number of candidates aided last year was only *eleven* in all.

Several Theological Colleges have set aside funds for the assistance of candidates for Orders, but these are devoted rather to the preparation for parochial work of ordinary candidates than to rendering such aid as the financial needs of many young men make desirable. Arrangements are made, in the Colleges referred to, which are likely to be very useful to the candidates,

by way of preparation; but there are some cases in which the arrangements are not such as will commend themselves to the taste or to the confidence of the Evangelical Protestantism of England. For example, at Cuddesdon Theological College, the services in the Parish Church and College Chapel are, "Daily Matins and Evensong, Prime, Sext, and Compline." These designations will be recognized as those of five of the seven canonical "Hours" of the Roman Catholic breviary ("Tierce" and "Nones" being omitted). The Book of Common Prayer knows nothing of "Prime, Sext, and Compline;" these terms are borrowed from a source which every Protestant must regard as alien to the Church of England.

In a conference held at Oxford in April, 1882, the training of candidates for Orders was discussed, when it was shown that special preparation for the ministry of the Church of England is at best much too brief, being limited, as a rule, to one or two years; and that during that short period, the teaching of doctrine and the homiletical training given in Theological colleges are defective. There is evidence in the consideration of such topics of an appreciation of their importance, and attempts are not unsuccessfully made to supply the young clergy with some experience in pastoral work before they undertake clerical duty. Some efforts are made in this direction which the Year-Book does not record; *e.g.*, no detailed mention is made in it of Wycliffe Hall, Oxford, an institution of which the Rev. R. B. Girdlestone (Hon. Canon of Christ Church, and formerly a Secretary of the British and Foreign Bible Society) is Principal. It is true to the Protestant Church of England in its arrangements and influence, and clergy who do their subsequent work in the spirit there fostered can scarcely fail to be very useful.

In the report of a Committee on the Diaconate, signed by the Bishop of Manchester, and presented to the Convocation of York, it is argued that financial and other difficulties make it impossible to meet the needs of the country, either by setting up new incumbencies or by increasing assistant curates, and that they can only be met by enlisting lay help, especially for the discharge of deacons' duties. For this the Committee recommend that suitable men, over thirty

years of age, who are married and continue in their secular callings, be admitted to deacons' Orders. In a note—intended to sustain the arguments of the report—it is stated that the number of licensed curates is about 6,500, or one-third of the number of parochial clergy; that nearly 1,200 of these have been ordained for fifteen years; that a constantly increasing number of curates have to wait for twenty or thirty years before obtaining preferment, while many have to remain curates all their lives; and that their average stipend is £120 per annum.

The most unsatisfactory features of the work of the Church of England come into view in this first chapter. It shows that the assistance provided for men without means is so limited that, with but few exceptions, admission to the ranks of the clergy is reserved for candidates with money; that the preparation of such candidates for the ministry as are forthcoming is imperfect and inadequate; while very many of the clergy are so long subjected to privation and to that "hope deferred" which "maketh the heart sick," that many men who are well qualified for service must shrink from joining the clerical ranks. Here is a most serious weakness; and it cannot fail to yield injurious results. To remedy this state of things will be very difficult, but it must be remedied if the Church of England is to prosper.

II. THE HOME MISSION WORK OF THE CHURCH.—Eleven sections exhibit the various operations embraced under this head. In this chapter and in the next the principal work of the Church of England is described, and both merit very careful attention. So far as a single issue of the Year-Book can show what the Church of England is doing for the religious welfare of the nation, it is herein set forth. The view is impressive, and all the more so, perhaps, because it is accompanied by the knowledge that what is seen is representative of more that is unseen. In several instances what is done in but a few dioceses is told as an indication of what is done generally; and beside this, we only find in the Year-Book what is on a diocesan or a still larger scale. The aggregate of work could only be ascertained by means of an acquaintance with all that is done in the several parishes (numbering 14,469) of England

and Wales. It is not possible to obtain and use the necessary information, but an approach might be made by the help of the Parochial Reports which are annually issued by nearly all the more energetic clergy in charge of parishes. Several such Reports are before us, and at least as many pages as we have lines at our disposal would be needed to do justice to their contents. Each Annual is a record of much labour and of large gifts. We can only mention two of these Reports, and in naming them we must not be misunderstood as intending to convey an impression that either of the two tells of what would command our complete and highest approval, or that they are the most satisfactory ones in our collection.

One is the Pastoral Address and Report of the now well-known Vicar of St. Jude's, Whitechapel, the Rev. S. A. Barnett. He is perhaps one of the least clerical of clerics, and his Annual tells of undertakings for the benefit of inhabitants of the East of London which are not ordinarily found in records of Church of England work. The following extract from the Address will be instructive:—

“The highest life of man will come as the result of all forms of good working together. . . . There is no single remedy for the evils we see, yet more and more it is evident that there is one cause which paralyses progress. Judged by the vulgar standard, some of the plans tried here have had success; judged by a higher standard they have failed. It is a small matter that people have better houses, that they have greater independence, that they take their pleasure less sadly. Such success gives no promise of the highest growth, gives no hope of a fuller life for the nation, higher than the love of comfort. The one cause which paralyses progress is the want of spiritual life.”

Mr. Barnett's task is a hard one; he has applied himself to it at a heavy personal cost in many ways; and we can appreciate motives when we cannot applaud modes of action. His record reminds us of Mrs. Barrett Browning's lines of protest in “Aurora Leigh.” She there speaks of

“ . . . . . the special outside plans

\* \* \* \* \*

Preferred by modern thinkers, as they thought  
The bread of man indeed made all his life,  
And washing seven times in the ‘People's Baths’  
Were sovereign for a nation's leprosy,

Still leaving out the essential prophet's word  
That comes in power."

We are not sure that Mr. Barnett is exactly one of the "modern thinkers" referred to by Mrs. Browning; but while he says, "We are fain to confess that (in this parish) the Church services exercise no influence comparable to the work they involve," he speaks of "the very little effect which these services have in making spiritual the life of the parish." What wonder that this is so if the ordinary services are similar in tone to the "Worship Hour Service" on Sundays "from 8.30 to 9.30," which is mentioned as one among "more special efforts?" At this service there are "solemn music" and "readings," which have been "chosen from various authors, but lately selections from Mazzini's 'Duties of Man' have been adapted and printed for the use of the congregation." Mr. Barnett thinks well of these endeavours and of similar ones; but they seem to us to be lamentably below the level of truly effective working, and we fear they must counteract what is better, if they do not displace it. The most effective means of social uplifting is "the grace of God that bringeth salvation," and we shall be much surprised if the laborious and costly methods adopted in St. Jude's, Whitechapel, prove to be as beneficial socially as John Wesley's Gospel-work was in equally difficult circumstances. We are not, however, blind to the value of Mr. Barnett's endeavours to improve the "Dwellings" in his parish; and we appraise at its worth the diligent and self-denying expenditure of money and labour necessary to set up and maintain "Clubs" and "Classes" of various kinds, "Mothers' Meetings," a "Fine Arts Exhibition," a "Library," a "Drinking Fountain," "Bands of Hope," an "Industrial School," a "Shoe-Black Society," a "Co-operative Society," a "Provident Dispensary," and so forth.

The "Year-Book of S. Mary Abbots, Kensington," is a report of "Parochial Work and Charities" in the West of London, and, therefore, among people of whom many possess abundant financial means and much leisure. It tells of what is done there by the Rev. the Hon. E. Carr Glyn and his six curates. To summarize, even, the contents of this Annual is not at present possible; but some idea of the extent and

variety of the work done in the parish, in addition to ordinary clerical duty in the church and out of it, may be obtained from two facts—(1) that the index to this Annual mentions sixty-five\* funds and agencies which are wholly or partially supported by the parish; and (2) that the General Financial Statement shows that, in addition to clerical income derived from usual sources (not stated), the sums raised for various purposes in the parish during 1882 amounted to £13,803 7s. 6d. Out of this amount some general funds of the Church of England received aid, but, after deducting such amounts, a very large balance remains, which is disbursed in the maintenance of local institutions. With but very few exceptions, the accounts are certified by either a lay treasurer or by accountants. The final page is suggestive; it states that Bible classes are held as follows:—On SUNDAYS: *two* for "Young Men in Business;" *two* for "Young Women in Service;" and *two* others for girls and young women respectively: these are conducted by ladies. On WEEK-DAYS: for "Women," "Men," "Young Women in Service," "Girls," "Younger Girls," "Elder Girls," "Young Women," "Young Men for Study of Hebrew," and "Young Men for Study of Greek Testament:" these are conducted by the Vicar, his assistant curates, and two ladies.

As we now turn to the "Official Year-Book" with some conception of the parochial work which is not represented therein, we find under this heading of "HOME MISSION WORK" a record of laborious and costly effort conducted on a large scale. It begins with a section relating to

*Church Building and Extension.*—Lord Hampton's Returns to the House of Lords show that between the years 1840 and 1874, 8,844 churches were built or restored,† at a cost of £24,453,261, to which must be added £1,095,342, ex-

\* One of the *sixty-five* lines in the index refers to the "General Offertory Account." In this there are *ninety-two* items, which may be taken to represent so many collections made in the parish church during the year. They amount to £2,871 13s. 11d., the first being January 7, "Miss Leigh's Homes in Paris," £15 4s. 9d., and the last, December 28, "Boy's Sunday School Library Fund," £2 14s. 4d.

† In returns from *nine* of the *twenty-eight* dioceses reported upon, churches *built* are not distinguished from churches *restored*. The imperfect totals so obtained are as follows: Churches *built*, 1,727; churches *restored*, 7,117; total, 8,844.

pended on 27 cathedrals. A supplementary table shows that the estimated sums spent on church building and restoration in *thirteen* specified dioceses, between 1872 and 1881, amounted to £4,346,469. The decennial period of this table overlaps that of the period of Lord Hampton's Returns by two years. When this is allowed for, and the expenditure in dioceses which are not included in the supplementary table is calculated at the same average rate as those which are included, it will be found that during the forty-one years named, about *thirty-three millions* sterling have been expended in the building and restoration of churches in England and Wales.

Further, it is shown by a summary contained in the thirty-third annual report of the Ecclesiastical Commissioners that between 1840 and 1881 they augmented 4,700 benefices, and that, through their instrumentality, the incomes of benefices have been increased by £756,000 per annum, or an amount which represents a capital sum of about *twenty-three millions* sterling. This computation includes £20,000 per annum contributed by benefactors to meet Commissioners' grants for curates in mining districts, and a supplementary sum of £145,000 per annum derived from benefactions.

The "Incorporated Church Building Society" has, during its existence of sixty-five years, done much to assist by grants schemes for church building, &c., in all parts of the country.

Section II. HOME MISSION WORK.—What large sums of money have been available for the purposes of church building and other forms of extension, the preceding paragraphs show, but such expenditure must depend for its effect on provision for bringing the Gospel to bear in its power upon the people individually. With a view to this much has been done by the Church of England, but far from enough, proportionately. Some of the Bishops have devoted to this purpose funds of which they could dispose; the Ecclesiastical Commissioners have assisted largely; the two Societies, "Pastoral Aid" and "Additional Curates," have helped as far as their means would allow;\* and in a few dioceses something is done towards increasing the number of clergy working in them. In the

---

\* Legacies chiefly raised the income of the former fund in 1882 to a larger

diocese of Rochester (which includes all London south of the Thames) a diocesan society is working successfully; the same may be said of the Bishops' Fund for the diocese of St. Albans; and in the diocese of London, by the Bishop of Bedford's work, about fifty missionary and assistant curates are supported, and the same number of lay agents, including deaconesses and mission women, all of whom (about 100) are employed in the East end of the metropolis. The Bishop himself takes part in the actual duty, preaching in the open air, and visiting in such places as lodging-houses, working men's clubs, and hospitals.

The "London Diocesan Home Mission," the "Oxford Diocesan Spiritual Help Society," and the "Exeter Diocesan Additional Curates Society," promote the increase of clerical agents in their respective localities; while the "Additional Curates and Lay Helpers' Fund for Stoke-on-Trent," in the diocese of Lichfield, combines with the object of the three societies previously named, one which is specifically provided for by some other societies; next of kin in aim and work are the "Church of England Scripture Readers' Association," and a like society for Yorkshire, both of which assist in the employment in parishes of persons whose time is chiefly occupied in reading aloud the Scriptures, in encouraging attendance on public worship, and in promoting the baptism of children and their attendance at week-day and Sunday schools. An Association, the income of which is insufficient for its very moderate expenditure, employs 187 mission women, in the house-to-house visitation of a class below that which is reached by ordinary district visiting.

Among more special agencies there are, (1)—two societies working for the Christianization of Jews—the "London Society" with stations in England and elsewhere in Europe, in Asia, and in North America, and the "Parochial Missions Fund;" (2) "Irish Church Missions to Roman Catholics," chiefly in the dioceses of Dublin and Tuam; (3) a "Navy Mission" (employing 24 readers); (4) The "Missionary Association for Hop Pickers;" the (5) "Young Men's" and (6) "Girls' Friendly"

---

amount than in 1881; but the income of the "Additional Curates" Society has declined, and before the two societies there are nearly 500 unaided cases, some of which are very needy.

Societies, and (7) a carefully planned "Young Women's Help Society."

The agencies, special and more ordinary, named or referred to above, embody much effort, and they can only have been maintained at a cost which very liberal gifts would be required to meet. But the Church of England has a very wide area to cover; and we are reminded by words used in this "Official Year Book," that a claim is set up respecting it, which, under the circumstances, savours strongly of arrogance—namely, that it is "the Church of the nation." Is it unreasonable to look for this claim to be backed by adequate provision for the religious wants of all classes of people throughout the land? If the Church of England be tried by this test, extensive and liberally supported as its work is, it must be pronounced wanting. The "Official Year-Book" exhibits a vast amount of labour and of gifts; but a careful study of its contents, accompanied by recollections which beget comparisons, shows indisputably that the nation cannot dispense with the help of other religious communities. How extensive that help is, may be seen from the Return of Churches and Chapels which has been made to the House of Commons in response to the motion of Mr. Henry H. Fowler. That Return is not unjustly complained of. On the one hand the *Guardian* complains that the Return of Churches and Chapels of the Church of England (14,573) is limited to those in which marriages are solemnized, while the enumerated "Places of Worship" of other denominations are not thus restricted, and that from the Return there are omitted all such buildings as Mission Churches and Schools, Schoolrooms and Iron Churches, licensed by Bishops for Church of England worship, while all such buildings are counted in the Return of Nonconformist places for worship. On the other hand, the *Nonconformist* contends that the number of "places for worship" not connected with the Church of England is much understated, and it sustains its contention by statistics which seem to be irrefragable.

It is indeed strange that when so much labour and money had to be expended in producing a Return, a Return should have been prepared and issued which cannot be relied upon to afford accurate and complete information; and, in particular,

such a return of the churches and chapels of the Church of England as cannot but mislead any one who relies upon it for the purpose of drawing comparisons between that Church and other denominations.

But, when all necessary allowances are made, some facts stand out, namely these,—that in the majority of registration districts the places of public worship provided by the Church of England are less numerous than those provided by other religious denominations; that most of the not inconsiderable number of registration districts in which the provision made by the Church of England exceeds, in number of places, that made by other denominations, are principally rural, and that in almost all the great centres of population the places of worship provided by other denominations outnumber those provided by the Church of England, and outnumber them generally to an extent which finds no counterpart in districts in which the provision of the Church of England furnishes the majority of places.

Many who have written on this subject have dealt with it as if the question raised were “whether the Church of England is or is not surpassed by other denominations in the provision of places for public worship.” That is not the question with which we are dealing. It is, whether the claim made on behalf of the Church of England, that it is “the Church of the Nation,” is sustained by facts. We say, first, that the evidence supplied by the “Official Year-Book” is so far from sustaining an affirmative reply that it must be held to be in support of a negative one; and, next, that Mr. Fowler’s Return, when all conceivable allowances are made, supplies an answer so distinctly negative that it is impossible either to misunderstand it or to explain it away.

Section III. of the Year-Book on HOME MISSION WORK supplies an account of Church of England provision for *Parochial Mission Services*. A society exists for the help of such services. It began its work as the “Aitken Memorial Mission Fund,” and the Rev. W. Hay Aitken is now the chairman of its directing committee. It carried out 131 missions during the year 1881–1882; it supports eight mission preachers; it makes grants towards the stipends of curates; and it employs lay preachers to conduct services in halls, school-rooms, tents, mission-rooms,

and in the open air. The dioceses of Lichfield, Truro, Lincoln, and Salisbury have their own agencies for work of the same kind; and the Year-Book supplies lists of recent and forthcoming missions, and also of mission preachers—clergymen who have gained experience in the work, and who are willing to assist in it as they may be able. In the list of mission preachers are the names of 132 clergymen.

Section IV. relates to *Our Cathedrals and their Services*. It contains the Report of the Royal Commission for Inquiry into the Condition of Cathedral Churches in England and Wales, in which the Commissioners say they have suggested arrangements to insure that the Cathedral pulpits shall be occupied by the most able preachers that can be found. It also records arrangements made for services in the years 1881–1882 in the St. Paul's, Lichfield, Wells, Worcester, Bangor, Manchester, and Ely Cathedrals, and in Westminster Abbey.

Section V. treats of the employment of *Lay Readers*. In the Convocation of Canterbury, and in that of York, in February 1882, Committees of both Houses were appointed to "consider and report on the proper functions, qualifications, and mode of admission of Lay Readers in the Church of England." A report on this subject was also submitted to the Central Council of Diocesan Conferences in 1882, which stated that it and kindred subjects had been under consideration in all kinds of Church assemblies, and proceeded to mention the favour with which it had been regarded by successive Church Conferences from 1872 onwards. In the diocese of London a "Lay Helpers' Association" has existed since 1865, for the purpose of extending, organizing, and formally incorporating the efforts of lay workers with the Church system, which has now 3,599 associates, of whom 167 are lay readers. The Bishop of Durham has heartily promoted the employment of Lay Readers. They are unpaid, since it is desired to enlist the services of zealous laymen who possess independent means, or, who, while earning their livelihood, have spare time which they would devote to this branch of Church work. The methods adopted in the dioceses of London, Lichfield, Ripon, and Lincoln are given, but the method of the Bishop of Durham is in most respects like them. It provides that each person proposed to be licensed

shall be nominated by the incumbent, and shall make a declaration respecting his belief and pledging him to prescribed conduct; if these preliminaries and the result of an interview are satisfactory, the Bishop issues a license or commission authorizing the holder to undertake certain duties. For such purposes carefully prepared forms are used, and provision has been made for the special training of Readers for their work. It may be necessary for the authorities of the Church of England to be careful respecting the formal admission of persons to its service, but the procedure in this matter appears to be overlaid with precaution, and to be far removed from that facile co-operation of laity and clergy which the needs of the case require. The number of Lay Readers employed is about 680. These are at work in *twenty* dioceses, nearly one-fourth of the whole number being employed in the diocese of London.

Section VI. gives a brief statement respecting *Guilds and Unions for the Advancement of the Devotional Life among Communicants and Church Workers*. These are found in the dioceses of Canterbury, Truro, Rochester, and Lichfield. The last-named diocese seems to be well to the front, if not foremost, in all such matters. The brief paragraph in the Year-Book which gives an account of the meeting of 500 members at Lichfield, in July, 1882, exhibits the development of ideas which the Bishop broached years ago in the Church of St. Mary, Newington, London, when he was rector of that parish. The highest purpose of these "Guilds" seems to be not unlike that of the best Methodist Class-Meeting; but there is a certain stiffness about the Church "Guild" which does not belong to its Methodist prototype. May not Methodists profitably notice that the need of some means of fostering that fellowship which promotes Christian faith, love, good works, and steadfastness, is so far felt by the most earnest Churchmen that they are trying to meet that need in the way indicated? Does it not point to this, that Methodists will do well to seek for an increase of the Christian thoroughness which covets and welcomes such means of grace as they are accustomed to, and to make these, as far as possible, always such as may be coveted and welcomed, rather than to consider in what way they are to be dispensed with as part of the organization of Methodism?

In Section VII. the Rev. Randall T. Davidson (now Dean of Windsor) contributes a paper on *The Duty of the Church towards Secularism and Kindred Hindrances to the Christian Faith*. He sees no evidence of the increase of secularism of the aggressive type; contends, quoting the Rev. Harry Jones, "that the best among the promoters of secularism are generally facing the great questions of the day, and according to their lights are seeking to benefit their fellows;" and urges, at the same time, that these teachers cannot, with a clear conscience, be left unrefuted because their Godless gospel contains its elements of good, but that it is the duty of the Church to do all in its power to win such "able and vigorous working men" to a knowledge of the truth and an appreciation of the Gospel of Christ. In proceeding to consider how this may best be done, he adduces reasons for doubting the advantage of ordinary attempts to "defend the Christian faith against all comers in public discussion upon an open platform," and then suggests a more excellent way. He advises that the object of all public attempts be rather to enunciate Christian truth carefully than to discuss it, and that if the public lecture be followed by discussion, it be conducted in another room. The work of the "London City Mission" is in an earlier section described as largely assisting that of the Church of England, although it is not a distinctive Church of England agency, and similarly, information is supplied at length in this section respecting the very useful operations of the "Christian Evidence Society," which was originated and is carried on by earnest men of many Christian denominations. The statement is followed by a brief outline of what has been recently done by the "Christian Evidence Committee" of the "Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge;" and an account is then given of efforts to discharge the "duty" named in the heading of this section, by means of lectures, classes, and otherwise, in the dioceses of York, Manchester, Peterborough, and London.

Section VIII. of the chapter on HOME MISSION WORK relates to the *Work of the Church among our Seafaring Populations and Emigrants*, to *Emigration and the Duty of the Church to Emigrants*. We regret that the limits of our space will not allow us to give any details, however interesting they might be.

Section IX. describes the operations of the *Incorporated Free and Open Church Association*; which seeks primarily (1) to do away with appropriated pews, and to substitute seats in accordance with the theory that "the parish church belongs of right to all the parishioners in common;" (2) to extend the use of the offertory, and to spread what are regarded as "sound views" respecting it; and (3) to promote the daily opening of churches for private prayer. To these general and original objects a Trusteeship for church purposes has been recently added.

Few Sections, if any, of the Chapter on HOME MISSION WORK are more interesting than No. X., which tells of work on behalf of Temperance Refuges and similar institutions.

*The Promotion of Temperance.* The "Church of England Temperance Society" has been in operation more than twenty years; but only recently have the extent and success of its efforts commanded general attention. Want of space, however, here also prevents us from supplying the interesting details which we had intended to give.

*Reformatory and Refuge Work.* At the head of this kind of work in the country is the "Reformatory and Refuge Union," which, however, is not wholly a Church of England institution. In immediate connection with the Church of England there are 11 reformatory schools, with 948 boys and girls in them; 27 certified industrial schools, with 2,941 scholars; 20 voluntary homes for children, with 873 residents; 3 homes for working lads, with 90 residents; 5 shoeblack brigades, with about 240 members; 4 homes for young women, with about 120 residents; 21 penitentiaries and homes, or receiving-houses for the fallen, with about 917 inmates. The total annual expenditure on these institutions exceeds £172,000, but much of the income of the two first-named may be derived from public sources. Still, when a deduction is made on this account, nearly £100,000 per annum remains, which must have been raised by private beneficence. The "Church Penitentiary Association" and the "Church Mission to the Fallen," have, of course, a specific work. Both enlist especially the help of devoted women, many of whom are unpaid, so that the work done cannot be gauged by the amount of expenditure upon it,

though that is not inconsiderable. A "Central Home for Waifs and Strays" has provided for about 100 destitute and orphan children.

The final Section (XI.) of the Chapter on HOME MISSION WORK relates to *Deaconesses and Nursing Institutions*; which are organizations constituted by the Church of England to provide for and to direct the ministries of women who are willing to devote themselves to such service. The information obtained is not complete, but it shows that the work undertaken by deaconesses includes nursing, visiting, conducting mothers' meetings, schools, and classes of all kinds, with general parish work; that they are solemnly set apart for their work by the Bishops; that they are not bound by vows; and that the term of service undertaken by them varies in duration. Ten Nursing Institutions are reported. These train women as nurses, and find them both paid and unpaid employment.

Chapter III. treats of the EDUCATIONAL WORK OF THE CHURCH in three Sections. The first of these is entitled *Elementary Education and Literature for the People*. The "National Society" is the organ and representative of the Church of England in the matter of elementary education. We should have been glad to supply statistics from the Report of the Committee of Council on Education for 1882-3, if it had been issued early enough; but as it has not been, we quote from the Year-Book, verifying and supplementing the figures which it supplies by those contained in the Government Blue Book of 1881-2.

Of 18,062 schools inspected in the year ending August 31st, 1881, 11,589 were connected with the National Society or Church of England, and 3,692 were under School Boards. In the schools inspected accommodation was provided for 4,389,633 scholars, of which accommodation the National Society or Church of England schools provided 2,351,235 places (in 1870, 1,365,080), and in Board Schools accommodation was provided for 1,194,268 scholars. The Church schools which provide the above-named accommodation have been built at a cost to the Church of England of £12,500,000, and more than half a million annually is contributed for their support by

the Church of England, in addition to £126,451 arising from endowments. At the inspection held during the year ending as above, 3,372,990 scholars were presented, of whom 1,753,573 were in Church schools, and 1,011,477 were in Board schools. The Parliamentary grant awarded on inspection amounted to £2,247,507, and of this sum £1,159,500 was paid for Church of England schools, and £677,300 for Board schools.

The religious teaching in Church of England schools is tested by a large body of diocesan inspectors at a cost of about £15,000 per annum, supplied by diocesan boards which are, in many cases, aided by grants from the National Society.

Thirty Church of England training colleges for teachers have been established at a cost to the Church of about £195,000, and in these colleges about two-thirds of the number of trained teachers employed in the country have been educated.

The Year-Book supplies some useful tables of statistics which show (1) the progress of Church schools since the year 1870; (2) the educational work of the Church compared with that of other bodies; and (3) the amount of voluntary contributions towards the maintenance of Church schools since 1870. Beside other matter, it furnishes the report of the Church Inspector of Training Colleges, and a sketch of the objects and work of the "National Society." From the last-named statement it appears that the "National Society" has expended since its formation in 1811 more than £1,100,000 in promoting the education of the children of the poor in the principles of the Established Church. Its grants are now devoted towards building and enlarging schools, promoting the efficiency of schools, the maintenance of Church training colleges, diocesan inspection, &c. The "General Association of Church School Managers and Teachers" was formed in 1872 for the purpose of bringing them into closer union and enabling them to express their opinions, to promote religious teaching in Church schools, and to advance interests common to managers and teachers.

Under the head of *Literature for the People*, statements are given respecting the "Christian Knowledge Society," the "Church of England Book Society," and the "Religious Tract Society;" which last, however, as is well known, is carried on, as it was established, upon the basis of united action by

Churchmen and Nonconformists. "Book Hawking Associations" were formerly much more numerous than they now are. Only ten survive; unfortunately, as it seems to us, for they are capable of rendering excellent service in the distribution of wholesome literature.

Section II. relates to *Higher Education*. It is occupied almost exclusively with information respecting what has been done for the establishment and maintenance of "Middle Class Schools" in five dioceses, and emphatically by the efforts of Canon Woodward. A well-merited tribute is paid to his labours and to those of Canon Lowe, which have resulted in the provision of education for more than 2,000 boys and girls in eight colleges or schools. But no information whatever is supplied by the Year-Book respecting the "Higher Education" which is well known to be given in direct connection with the Church of England in the public schools of Rugby, Eton, Winchester, Westminster, Charterhouse, Merchant Taylors', Harrow, St. Paul's, and Shrewsbury; nor is anything said respecting the numerous endowed schools, such as that of Dulwich, to mention only one of a multitude. Nor is one word said (except in very brief and formal lists given at the end of the book) respecting University education. These are very serious omissions, which, no doubt, will be supplied in future issues of the Year-Book. But they give an aspect of poverty to the Section II. on *Higher Education* which does not at all correspond to the facts of the case. Something might fairly have been said concerning the Syndicates of Oxford and Cambridge, and with respect to the examinations which they annually conduct. Even respecting Middle Class schools of the Church of England, the information supplied is very meagre. The next Year-Book will probably furnish important and suggestive facts respecting the Church Middle Class Schools Company, which has been formed since the issue of the volume before us.

Section III. relates to *Sunday Schools*, an agency which has been worked by the Church of England to an extent with which probably not many persons are acquainted.

The Bishop of Ely, in an anniversary sermon on behalf of the Church of England Sunday School Institute, in May, 1882, said:—

"The true foundation of the Sunday school amongst ourselves is to be found in the rubric which enjoins that 'the curate of every parish shall diligently upon Sundays and Holydays after the second lesson at evening prayer openly in the Church, instruct and examine so many children of his parish sent unto him as he shall think convenient in some part of the catechism.' The increase of population has rendered this provision inadequate; but the Sunday school gathered together in another building, the association with the clergyman of a staff of male and female catechists, acting in subordination to himself, and under his own supervision, is really only such an enlargement of the system sketched in the Prayer Book as the lapse of years and the multiplication of children have rendered imperative."

This reference to the rubric is a reminder of the frequent recurrence of services for children on Sunday afternoons in churches. How attractive and effective these services are is well known; they must materially assist the work of the Church in Sunday schools, and it will be strange if Nonconformists do not speedily supplement their work by services similar in character and frequency.

With what resolution the Sunday school is used as an agency in Church of England work, and what value is set on it as such, is shown by the following extract from a charge delivered by the Bishop of Ely in 1881. The Bishop says:—

"The parish priest must regard it as *his* Sunday school; the Sunday school must be undisguisedly a Church school. As its head is the parish priest, so its object is to train its scholars to join with the spirit and the understanding in the worship and ordinances of the Church, to prepare them for Confirmation and Holy Communion. . . . The instruction should be dogmatic and distinctive. In dealing with young minds the teaching which takes root is ever sharp and decisive. . . . The Text Book of the Church Sunday school is the Church Catechism."

Favour is shown to the grading of schools and the use of graduated lessons in Sunday schools upon the following model recommended in the diocese of Pennsylvania:—(1) Infant School; (2) Main School, having each class a unit in grade; (3) Bible Classes, these to be graded according to age and culture; (4) Normal Class, for preparation of teachers.

Preparation Classes and Teachers' Examinations are effectively promoted by the "Church of England Sunday School Institute." During 1881, in addition to other services rendered to Sunday schools, it issued 1,500,000 publications of

all kinds; provided visitors to attend and furnish instruction at meetings of Sunday school teachers, together with Central Normal Classes; and it conducted an examination of teachers in England and Wales, Scotland, Ireland, and the Colonies, which was attended by nearly 1,000 candidates. The Christian Knowledge Society has its department for Sunday school grants. While the Year-Book records and advocates diocesan action, it recommends co-operation, in some matters, with the Central Institute. After mentioning what is being done for the promotion of Sunday school work in several dioceses, the Year-Book gives an account of a successful attempt to carry on a Middle Class Sunday school at Windsor.

We may note here that the astonishing increase in the number of Sunday schools belonging to the Church of England during the last thirty years is one of the most remarkable facts connected with the history of that Church.

No document contained in the Year-Book is more significantly instructive than a Statistical Table, which shows that in the Sunday schools of 8,405 parishes of England and Wales, or .58 of the whole number (14,469) leaving .42 of the parishes unaccounted for, there was an average attendance of 503,951 scholars in the morning, or 39 per cent., and of 740,582 in the afternoon, or 57 per cent.; with a total number of 1,289,273 scholars on the books of the 16,498 schools of parishes making returns. It is much to be regretted that a return has not been made by every parish, for although we know that 6,064 parishes made no return, it is impossible to guess at the totals which would have been forthcoming if the returns had been complete; because it is entirely uncertain whether Sunday schools exist in all the parishes which make no returns, and if they exist, how they are attended and officered. If one might calculate for the schools which make no returns on the basis supplied by those which do, the total number of scholars in Church of England schools would be 2,222,884. For the reasons named, however, such figures would be altogether uncertain, and might be misleading. But it is not unlikely that the number of Sunday scholars in all Church of England schools is not less than 2,000,000. At present we must be content with the returns said to be "trustworthy" from the

8,405 parishes. The 16,498 Sunday schools in them, had an average of about 78 scholars on the books of each school, with an average of less than 7 teachers, or a total of 113,412 teachers. The number of scholars over 14 years of age was 168,734, or about 13 per cent.; and the number of scholars who are communicants was 48,680, or 3·8 per cent.

It may be useful to compare with these returns the statistics of Wesleyan Methodist Sunday schools in England and Wales, which were presented to the Conference of 1882 (being for the period corresponding to that of the returns in the Year-Book). They show that the number of Wesleyan Methodist Sunday schools in England and Wales was 6,433, with an average number of 128 scholars on the books of each, or a total of 823,688 scholars. In each Wesleyan Methodist Sunday school there were, on an average, 19 teachers and officers, or a total of 122,336. The number of scholars over 15 years of age was 176,879, or 21·4 per cent., and the number of scholars "in Society," or "on Trial," was 92,522, or more than 11 per cent.

It will be seen that there are respects in which Church of England Sunday school work does not compare favourably with that of Wesleyan Methodist schools. The Church of England schools are much smaller—*i.e.*, in each Church of England Sunday school there are, on the average, far fewer scholars than in a Wesleyan Sunday school; the proportion of teachers to scholars in the former class of schools is not much more than one-third of that which obtains in the latter class; the proportion of senior scholars is also very much lower (13 over 14 years of age in Church schools, where in Wesleyan schools there are 21 scholars over 15 years old); and the proportion of scholars who are Communicants is only one-third of the proportion of scholars who are "Members of Society" in Wesleyan schools. The average afternoon attendance in Wesleyan schools is 7 per cent. better than in Church schools.

The total numbers of Church Sunday schools, teachers, and scholars is not ascertained; but it is sure not to equal the aggregate of those of all other Protestant bodies. Consequently, extensive as the Sunday school work of the Church of England is in itself, it will not tend to justify a claim that the Church of

England is "the Church of the nation," nor will it sustain an expectation that that Church is likely to become so.

In Chapter IV., which contains three Sections, the FOREIGN MISSION WORK of the Church of England is described.

Section I. relates to *Central and Special Organizations*. First among these is the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts. It was incorporated by a charter granted in 1701; its first sphere of labour being in that part of North America which is now known as the United States. John Wesley's mission to Georgia was one of many missions which this society sustained on the American continent. After the War of Independence, one of the Society's missionaries, in 1784, obtained consecration from the Bishops of the Church of Scotland. Three other Bishops were subsequently consecrated in England; these consecrated other Bishops in America, and created new bishoprics, so that now they number 65, with an ordinary clergy exceeding 3,000. Thus arose and spread the Anglo-American Episcopal Church of the United States, which is about to complete its centenary of independence. It has extended itself over North America, and has sent out its missions to various parts of Asia, Africa and Europe. At first the efforts of the Society for Propagating the Gospel were only among colonists, but they have since been extended to others also, and the Society has expended labour and funds in the West Indies, Australia, India, China, South Africa, New Zealand and Polynesia, where it has assisted in the endowment of 16 Sees by grants amounting to more than £38,000.

*The Church Missionary Society for Africa and the East* seeks to spread the Gospel among the heathen. The present sphere of its operations comprises Africa—West, East, and Central—Palestine, Persia, India, Ceylon, Mauritius, China, Japan, New Zealand, North-West America, and the North Pacific.

The "Zenana Missionary Society," the "South American Mission" (formerly known as the Patagonian Mission), the "Central African Mission" (being the Universities Mission which Dr. Livingstone founded), the "Oxford Mission to Calcutta," the "Delhi Mission," the "Indian Church Aid Association," the "Maritzburg Mission," the "Melanesian Mission," the "Colonial and Continental Church Society," a "Section of the

Work of the Christian Knowledge Society," the "Anglo-Continental Society"—with several other agencies which are not mentioned in the Year-Book—are forms in which the missionary zeal and liberality of the Church of England displays itself.

In the Year-Book the "British and Foreign Bible Society" is placed as if it were a Church of England Society; it is well known that it is not so, but that—as indeed the Year-Book intimates—it is supported by Protestant Christians of all denominations. One of its distinctive purposes is to circulate Holy Scripture *without note or comment*; but the Society for the Promotion of Christian Knowledge (which has—beside issuing commentaries, catechisms, manuals, hymn-books, evidential works, grammars and dictionaries in various foreign languages—published portions or the whole of the Prayer Book in fifty-nine languages) is now devoting much energy to the publication of foreign versions of the Bible *with comments*.

The Rev. W. Scott Robinson properly classifies the British and Foreign Bible Society among "Joint Societies of Churchmen and Nonconformists." His analysis and summary which, perhaps, are not strictly accurate and complete in all respects, show, however, that in 1881 the British contributions to foreign missions by societies not "Church of England" amounted to nearly £630,000, being more than £165,000 in excess of the amount of contributions from Church of England Societies.

Section II. is devoted to an account of what is done for the *Training of Missionaries* of the Church of England in such colleges and institutions as those of St. Augustine, Canterbury; Islington; Warminster; &c. There are also about twenty diocesan institutions, which in 1881 assisted from 70 to 80 missionary students.

Section III. furnishes *Official Reports of the Colonial Bishops*. These exhibit the extent of each diocese, the Church work done in it, its educational undertakings, its finance, its needs, &c. The reports (which occupy 27 pages) are instructive, but their contents cannot be summarized here.

The reading of this Chapter excites thankfulness that in so many forms and in so many parts of the world the Church of England is working for the spread of the Gospel. Much as one cannot but regret to find indications that a less worthy aim

prompts some gifts and directs some efforts, it would be unchristian to refrain from a grateful appreciation of the foreign mission work of the Church of England. The statements of the Year-Book, however, show that whatever may be the merits of the episcopal system, it cannot count among them either economy of expenditure or freedom of working ; and that the Church of England is at least as far from holding a monopoly of Christian zeal and usefulness abroad as she is at home.

Our space is exhausted before we have summarized one-half of the Chapters in Part I. of the Year-Book. Those dealt with, however, concern what will be regarded as the essential and most important features of the work of the Church of England. The titles of remaining Chapters have already been given in this article. They are not all of equal importance. Among those of especial interest are Chapters relating to proceedings in Convocation ; in the Church Congress of 1882, and previous Congresses ; and in diocesan conferences. The *Chronological Record of Events* in Chapter XI. is full, interesting, and useful ; and the final Chapter on *Recent Church Literature* is distributed into Sections entitled as follows :—"Devotional ;" "Poetry and Hymns ;" "Doctrinal and Controversial ;" "Church History ;" "Bible History ;" "Liturgical ;" "Biographical ;" "Sermons ;" "Commentaries ;" "Bibles, Greek and English Testaments ;" and "Miscellaneous." It occupies twenty-four pages, each of which consists of three columns ; the first gives the title of the book and its publisher ; the second the name of the author ; and the third a short description of the book. It is a catalogue which is as instructive and interesting as it is valuable and striking.

The STATISTICAL RECORDS in Part II. relate to Ordinations, Confirmations, Grants of Ecclesiastical Commission, Queen Anne's Bounty, Church Building and Restoration, New Districts, Societies' Incomes, &c.

Part III. furnishes CATALOGUES OF THE OFFICERS AND SOCIETIES OF THE CHURCH, including the "Bishop and Officers of each Diocese ; the "Colonial Bishops and their Commissioners ;" the "Universities ;" "Principals of Theological and Training Institutions ;" the "Secretaries, Board Meetings, &c., of Church Societies."

## ART. VI.—HOPES AND FEARS FOR MADAGASCAR.

1. *Parliamentary Papers (Africa)*, No. 1 (1883). Correspondence respecting Madagascar in 1882-83.
2. *Madagascar Tracts*, No. 2. French Doings among the Sakalava and Hova. London: A. Kingdon & Co. 1883.
3. *Antananarivo Annual and Madagascar Magazine*. No. 6. Antananarivo: London Mission Press. 1882.
4. *The Great African Island. Chapters on Madagascar*. By JAMES SIBREE, JUN., F.R.G.S. London: Trübner & Co. 1880.

EVENTS are marching rapidly in Madagascar. No one in this country would probably have ventured to predict a year ago that the little cloud, no bigger than a man's hand, which then cast its shadow over the great African island, would so soon develop into the pitiless storm of to-day. Yet already we have seen expectation darken into anxiety, anxiety into dread, and the less sanguine amongst us have almost allowed dread to petrify into despair. Even before this *Review* comes into the hands of the public, occurrences may have taken place to disappoint the hopes—or it may even be the fears—of the many friends of Madagascar in this country. And it can scarcely be doubted that upon the restraint exercised by the Government of the Republic, by the Queen of Madagascar, and possibly also by the English people, during the next few weeks, the future of the Malagasy nation largely depends. For this reason we are anxious that the British public, or that section of it which will read these words, should not only know accurately but feel truly on this question, and while avoiding indifference on the one hand, should on the other refrain not only from words, but if possible even from thoughts of anger, selfishness, and unbelief. For there may come at any moment more heartrending news from Madagascar than such as have been received as yet; and then only by a strong effort will faith in the ultimate evolution of good out of evil refuse to be mastered by ill tidings. Anger would be particularly out of

place, especially if allied with selfishness. Honest indignation, expressed in such a form as to involve if need be a sacrifice of our own blood and treasure, out of a disinterested care for an oppressed nation, might be quixotic but it would not be ignoble. On the other hand mere fretful outbursts of petulance at the predominance of French authority in Madagascar only irritate our neighbours without benefiting either them, the Malagasy, or ourselves. For our own part we do not believe that jealousy of France has any appreciable effect upon the present temper of England in regard to this question. If mercantile interests were deeply touched by recent events, we may depend upon it that the outcry raised would be sufficient to rouse the Government to some more decisive steps than have been taken; for the heart of England vibrates very much in unison with the indications of the national purse-barometer. In commercial circles, however, there is an impression that the result even of a French conquest of Madagascar would not greatly injure British trade. It is England, not France, that has the surplus population and surplus capital for new enterprises there, and whoever may open up the country we shall reap most of the benefit. Other men may labour, and we shall enter into their labours.

But while the French press is mistaken in accusing us of jealousy, it would be equally mistaken if it supposed that England was indifferent on this subject. The present writer has had opportunities of ascertaining the views of a great number of people in different parts of this country—opportunities which he has not failed to use. In every case, without a single exception, he has observed the strongest disapprobation of the conduct of France, not on account of any anticipated injury to England, but simply out of sympathy with the Malagasy. Again and again have disinterested and intelligent men, with no suspicion of what is popularly known as “Jingoism,” asked how it is that our Government allow a great wrong to be perpetrated without interference, and in nearly every instance has the reply, that it is understood that “England cannot act as the police of the world,” failed to satisfy the inquirers. When, however, it is asked why the understanding between England and France, whereby the independence of Madagascar is mutu-

ally agreed to, is not maintained, the answer is not so easy. To the unsophisticated lay mind some further explanations seem to be necessary. Writing on October 7, 1882, Lord Granville says: "The understanding between Great Britain and France has hitherto been that the two Governments should maintain an identic attitude of policy in Madagascar, and act in concert in the matter; and Her Majesty's Government would view with regret the advancement, on the part of France, of any territorial claims which might be calculated to disturb that understanding."\* But writing again, on the 29th of November, Lord Granville simply refers to what has been the practice in the past, and omits any repetition of the desire of England to continue that practice. This is how the earlier statement is emasculated:—"Great Britain and France have the same interests in Madagascar, and have hitherto acted in concert in all matters affecting their relations with the Hova Government."†

In reply, M. Duclerc refers to "the common interests of the two countries in Madagascar," and "the agreement which has inspired their policy on other occasions towards the Government of Tananarive" (*sic*); but in the same despatch M. Duclerc, waxing bold, assumes the right of France to a Protectorate on the north-west coast. Of this reply Lord Granville writes: "I expressed no opinion on the despatch;" and thus apparently the matter was left.

Now, we do not fear that a rupture may take place with France, but we do wish that the French people understood the nature and depth of English feeling on this question. It is not one of personal or national interest, not of hate or jealousy, but rather of pity for the Malagasy, and horror that our common civilization should be discredited by association with the events of the last two years. Our fear is rather lest this disgust should become a nucleus to which may gather in time accretions of other antagonistic sentiments, all tending to widen the distance between ourselves and the Republic. So far this feeling has not made itself heard by any deafening clamour, but it may

---

\* *Africa*, No. 1, 1883; Letter No. 12.

† *Ibid.*, Letter No. 25.

prove enduring enough to injure for many years to come those sentiments of respect and confidence which near neighbours should always have for each other. Insufficient in itself to provoke a war, it might yet produce that condition of prejudice and rankling vexation which is like ground already prepared to receive and nourish the seeds of conflict. To our minds it would be the saddest of all the sad things that have ever happened to France if her unprecedented troubles should demoralize her and make her less sensitive than hitherto to the delicate impulses of honour and magnanimity. The chivalry of France is too noble to be lightly flung away. It is bad enough to be made to suffer, but it is worse to be made to sin. To have been maimed and trampled upon is grievous, but to have been taught thereby to maim and trample upon others is more grievous still. To endure humiliation is painful, but to both endure it and inflict it is calamitous. And we are bound to say that, although we cannot believe France is permanently demoralized, so far her conduct in relation to Madagascar has exhibited a phase of character that to her friends of seventy years, who yearn to be her friends still, is most painful to contemplate—painful because indicative of discordant ideas incompatible with the maintenance of solid friendship and hearty good-will. It is against this that, whether France listens to it or not, the rising murmurs of thousands of our fellow-countrymen exclaim. And it is to be noted that the antipathies of nations are more conducive to serious results than tart despatches, and that the creation of bitter recollections is more to be dreaded than a little polite sparring between the two Foreign Offices.

Of course, we may be told that it is impertinent to write in this strain; that England has not clean hands in regard to her own treatment of native races; that again and again she has been cowardly enough to use her giant's strength with giant force upon helpless aborigines; and that she has reason to be ashamed rather than proud to say that upon her dominions the sun never sets.

We are not prepared within the limits of the present article to enter into a disquisition upon the historical and political questions involved in these charges. It will be sufficient to

remark that the modern policy of England is characterized by a tendency to avoid further acquisitions of territory. Fiji was gained neither by conquest nor intrigue, but was ceded to and almost forced upon us; we have retired from Afghanistan, and the Transvaal has been given up to the Boers. Even in earlier times it may be doubted if pretensions to any country were ever advanced by our rulers under such circumstances as those which mark the recent procedure of France in regard to Madagascar. Nor, were it otherwise, could a policy of wanton aggression, even though favoured by the statesmen of our own country, by any possibility meet with approval in the present day from the majority of the English people. The Government that attempted it would be checked with far more energy and earnestness than have been shown in the few and feeble French criticisms of French foreign policy. And if in the pages of this REVIEW there appear animadversions upon that policy, they are not prompted by any hostility to the great nation in whose name it is conducted. Not because it is French, but because it is wrong do we condemn it. England might one day be every whit as bad as France, but if so we trust that we could and should be less unsparing in condemning the sins of our country. But we also remember that England will never clearly see her own faults in herself: it is only as they are reflected in others that their veritable ugliness is manifest; and for the sake of our own land, as well as in the interests of righteousness, and on behalf of an inoffensive but advancing nation, we desire to share in the general European and American protest against the recent proceedings in regard to Madagascar.

It was in September, 1881, that the decision appears to have been taken which so far has decided the fate of Madagascar. In that month, M. Baudais arrived at Tamatave, as successor to M. Meyer, who for a short time had been Consul for France in Madagascar. The French man-of-war *Nièvre*, which brought him, is the same vessel as the other day, it is alleged, carried away our eminent fellow-countryman, Mr. Shaw, to his "trial" at Réunion. There was a great deal of saluting from the battery on shore and the ship in the harbour, followed by a reception by the Governor, after which the newly-accredited Consul proceeded with every mark of respect to the Capital,

200 miles inland. M. Meyer, whose relations with the Government of Madagascar and the representatives of other nations were believed to have been of a comparatively peaceful character, appears to have been superseded not for any negligence or fault, or from failure of health, but simply, as it was currently reported in Tamatave, to make way for an official who came to Madagascar expressly to carry out an aggressive policy. By the following June M. Baudais had so far succeeded in his mission that his naval colleague, Captain Le Timbre, of the *Forfait*, was able to announce a resort to force. On the 5th of May, in a speech to the Governor of Tamatave, M. Le Timbre had stated "that the Malagasy flag which had been sent on the sly to the West Coast must be recalled as soon as possible, if it was not to be torn down like a useless piece of rag and thrown into the sea;"\* and on the 26th of June, M. Le Timbre announced to M. Baudais that he had "seized the said flags." By this act France through her representatives declared in a most practical form her claim to supremacy over nearly one-third of Madagascar, a claim in comparison with which all others are insignificant.† It remained to be seen whether the Home Government would support this declaration; but the suspense was not protracted. On the 16th of August, Lord Lyons, in forwarding to his chief a note from M. Duclerc, then newly installed in office, refers to "claims which the French Government has, it says, long been urging upon the Hova Government," and continues, "but the alleged grievance to which it gives most prominence is the hoisting of the flag of the Queen of Madagascar, on territory situated on the North-west of the island, which it states to be subject to the Protectorate of France in virtue of existing treaties."‡

In M. Duclerc's own letter it is stated that "a long time ago" the failure of the Malagasy Court "to carry out the engagements which bind it to us gave rise to the commencement of negotiations." It would be interesting to learn exactly when those negotiations commenced. They can hardly have

\* *Antananarivo Annual and Madagascar Magazine*, Christmas, 1882.

† *Ny Gazety Malagasy* (the official organ of the Government of Madagascar), July 7, 1883.

‡ "Africa," No. 1, 1883, No. 6.

occurred during the pleasant consulship of M. Meyer; but a great deal depends upon what Frenchmen understand by the word *negociations*. If it is the Gallic equivalent for "bluster," then we think we remember the time referred to. It would be in the memorable days of M. Meyer's predecessor, whose method of "negotiating" was unique. It is said that "his talk was of war ships and general demolition by shot and shell. He also deliberately insulted the Queen, by scornfully addressing her as 'Queen of the Hova,' instead of using the title 'Queen of Madagascar,' which she bears in all the treaties; and otherwise behaved himself as the officials of the politest nation in Europe too often do when they are away from home and their compeers."\* But it is only just to his memory to say that he behaved with great impartiality. Whether he was asked to support the claims of French citizens to Malagasy territory, or to uphold the attacks of personal violence made and instigated by the Jesuit Fathers upon Protestant teachers in the Betsiléo province, M. le Commissaire seemed equally ready to carry on "*negociations*." Only when matters became quieter did he become restless, and failing other objectives, began to "negotiate" with his fellow-citizens, the priests, in Antananarivo. Even then he was not happy. The sweetly unctuous disposition of the proverbial Jesuit did not harmonize well with the corrosive acrimony of this bitter official—glycerine and vitriol go far to form a dangerous compound—and detonations were the natural result. No one, therefore, was surprised at his removal, and M. Meyer's appointment, for at that time there was no reason to believe that the Central Government of France either sanctioned or contemplated aggressive proceedings in Madagascar. Even when M. Meyer in turn was removed and M. Baudais appointed, and when the policy of the latter was observed to fulfil the most alarming predictions respecting it, there were still many who were unwilling to believe that the new consul's proceedings were the result of deliberate resolves on the part of the French Foreign Office, until the circumstances attending the visit of the Malagasy Embassy to Paris last year compelled a different opinion. Unhappily subsequent events have only

---

\* *Madagascar Tracts*, No. 2, p. 13.

tended to confirm this opinion. Without repeating here the now well-known points of dispute between the two Governments, it may not be out of place to allude briefly to the most serious—viz., the French claim to destroy the integrity and independence of the kingdom of Madagascar. Except to make an opportunity of putting forward this claim perhaps we should never have heard of any others. In a valuable pamphlet published last November\* its groundlessness was demonstrated, and there is therefore no need to add anything here to the clear statement then put forward by the Madagascar Committee. But the growth of, as well as the method of prosecuting, this claim are worthy of a moment's notice.

It has already been pointed out that M. Baudais' first opportunity for offensive tactics was connected with the hoisting by certain local chiefs of the flag of the Queen of Madagascar. Hitherto those chiefs, while professing allegiance to Queen Rànavàlona, had, it appears, no other flag than a red one, a colour which, as that of the slave-trading Arabs, seemed incapable of arousing French susceptibilities. It was only when these chiefs changed the colour from the Arabian red to the Malagasy white that the Commissaire and his naval coadjutor discovered "the rights of France alone to raise her flag on the towns of the West Coast, as their chiefs had accepted the protectorate of France."† It would appear, too, from Lord Granville's despatch that our own Government, while they are aware that the islands of Mayotte, 180 miles from the nearest point on the north-west coast, and Nòsibè, at the entrance to Pàsandàva Bay, are now occupied by the French, "yet recognize the Queen of Madagascar as absolute monarch of the whole island."‡ Nor is this recognition to be wondered at. The first intimation of any modification of the late Queen's position appears to have been given by M. Duclerc in August, 1882, in alluding to "Conventions formerly concluded by various independent chiefs;" but it was not until December 3, and then only after repeated inquiries, that Lord Granville

---

\* "What are 'French Claims' on Madagascar? A Statement of the Madagascar Committee."

† *Antananarivo Annual*, 1882, p. 127.

‡ "Africa," No. 1, 1883, pp. 7, 8.

learnt that these "Conventions" were "private treaties concluded in 1840-1 between France and the independent chiefs of the north-west coast."\* From the wording of M. Duclerc's despatch it would seem as though the first notification of these "private treaties" (*traités particuliers*) was made by M. Baudais some months after his arrival in Antananarivo. This was after an interval of over forty years, during which time France had never mounted her flag on the mainland of Madagascar; had never exercised her "protection" of the "independent chiefs;" had made treaties with the Sovereigns of Madagascar, in which, without reservation, the integrity of their kingdom was acknowledged; had paid, without dispute, the usual customs, dues to the representatives of the central Government at the north-western as at the other ports; and had even claimed and obtained an indemnity of nearly 50,000 francs from the Queen of Madagascar for a so-called "outrage" committed by one of these self-same "independent chiefs of the north-west coast" upon Arabs engaged in illegal acts while sailing under French colours. Whatever may be the morality of secret treaties in the abstract, we cannot refrain from saying that the course adopted with regard to these treaties in particular is, according to the religious rather than the political code, simply indefensible. It is neither straight nor transparent. It meanders like the Seine, and is as turbid as the Thames at Blackwall.

When we turn to the active measures taken within the last few months there is but little consolation to be found. The bite is as bad as the bark, and worse. The threats of force which even the least sanguine on-lookers hardly regarded as serious were, as it proved, by no means empty ones. When the news of the bombardment of Mojanga reached London, even the Malagasy Embassy then staying there were surprised, and the surprise was greater still to the inhabitants of Antananarivo. Considering the honour and intelligence displayed by the Government of Madagascar in the conduct of their affairs with European powers, they certainly had reason to expect that France would send in an ultimatum before commencing hostilities.

---

\* "Africa," No. 1, 1883, pp. 3, 7, 23.

Even admitting that the Malagasy are not yet fully civilized, it is to be regretted that, at least so far as they would appreciate and reciprocate the usages of civilized nations, those usages were not duly observed. Conduct that would scarcely have been palliated in Cetewayo, and certainly would have been blameworthy in the Malagasy, is altogether inexcusable in France. Not only were the lives of the many British subjects who were in the capital when the sudden news of the attack arrived placed in jeopardy, but the lives of over 100 French citizens also. The proceedings on the east coast again, in firing upon the town of Fenoarino without any notice at all, is even more reprehensible. Moreover it would be difficult to justify the refusal to respect the badges of the ambulance corps organised by Mr. Shaw at Tamatave; while the summary act of shooting down in the streets without trial any natives seen carrying even their own effects saved from the ruins of the town would not seem to have been requisite to preserve order; and if unnecessary it was inhuman. It is on the coast, too, that questions affecting British subjects have arisen. That Mr. Aitken, a man of high integrity, sober judgment and—what is is unfortunately none too common in Tamatave—pure life, deservedly respected by all classes, should have been arrested at about the same time as Mr. Shaw, looks something more than a coincidence. Both are men of moderate views and prudent habits; and both, unlike most coast residents, had gained at one time or another personal knowledge, not only of the mere Creole colony of Tamatave, but of Madagascar proper—*i.e.*, the capital and the central provinces. Consequently both had seen life in Madagascar under different aspects from those which present themselves to naval officers who visit only the ports, or to the shifting population of outlaws and ne'er-do-weels from Mauritius and Réunion, who seldom go far from the element upon which they were borne thither. Mr. Shaw, it may be observed, was the only missionary of the London Missionary Society stationed either in Tamatave or anywhere else on the east coast of Madagascar, and he was the very first representative of that society who came in the way of the agents of France. Fortunately, Mr. Shaw stands in no need of eulogy from his fellow-countrymen. A French correspondent

of the *Mauritius Merchants and Planters' Gazette* writes from Tamatave :—

" M. Shaw est, quoi qu'on en dise, un homme de bien qui s'était toujours fait remarquer par une grande charité, une véritable tolérance. Indépendamment de ses fonctions ecclésiastiques, il faisait aussi de la médecine, et s'il possédait quelque influence sur les Hovas, [il n'en a usé qu'en vue du bien général. L'histoire dira un jour, peut-être, que si Tamatave, avant ou pendant le bombardement, a été préservé d'une conflagration générale, c'est grâce à lui. . . . Mon opinion bien arrêtée à l'égard de M. Shaw, c'est qu'il n'est coupable de rien, c'est une personnalité importante dont l'honorabilité et la charité contrastaient mal avec l'immoralité et la rapacité de certaines gens."

Nevertheless we are far from blaming Admiral Pierre, who is described as "grave and discreet," "calm and prudent," and absolutely incapable of discourtesy. We only regret that a sudden attack of ophthalmia should have deprived him of the opportunity of displaying these estimable qualities. What aggravates our disappointment is, that ophthalmia is not one of the prevalent diseases of Europeans in Madagascar. But if we exonerate the Admiral, it is impossible to avoid the conclusion that either his superiors or his inferiors must be to blame. Either his instructions cannot have been sufficiently clear, or else his subordinates cannot have carried out his courteous orders in the spirit in which they were issued. When Mrs. Shaw, after an absence of nearly two years through serious ill-health, arrived in Tamatave harbour in June last, it was only to hear that her husband was under arrest. She, however, waited on Admiral Pierre twice to ask leave to see her husband, if only for a moment, a request with which the Admiral's instructions, framed, it may be supposed, with a view to exactly such a contingency as this, did not permit him to comply. It appears, on high authority, that Mr. Shaw was "not actually imprisoned, but he was on board a French vessel, of which, of course, he had the free range." Now, as Mrs. Shaw was being rowed back from the flag-ship to the *Taymouth Castle*, she desired to catch a glimpse of her husband's face as she passed the *Nièvre*, on board which ship he "was not actually imprisoned." Even this faint shadow of a privilege, however, was denied her, for Mr. Shaw was not allowed to come for a moment

upon the deck of the ship "of which," to use the Premier's own words, "of course, he had the free range."\* Mr. Shaw has now, however, been set at liberty, and we are assured that chronology proves this to have been the spontaneous act of the officials on the spot. We are not anxious to examine too minutely into this point. We are so glad at the happy issue to our fears for Mr. Shaw and for the disturbance of international goodwill, that we do not care to be very critical; but we have, none the less, a genuine satisfaction in finding that a further scrutiny of this event only makes the state of affairs appear more re-assuring. For if it is clear that Mr. Shaw's release was due to the independent action of the officials in Réunion, it is equally clear that Mr. Gladstone could not have anticipated the course they would pursue, and that, therefore, in replying to questions during the last week of the Parliamentary session, the Premier's hopeful view of Mr. Shaw's case must have rested rather upon what he believed to be the disposition of the authorities at the Quai d'Orsay than of the intentions of the Admiral. It appears, further, that Mr. Shaw was transferred to the *Nièvre*, and that he left in that ship for Réunion some time before the 8th of July, the date on which H.M.S. *Stella* left Tamatave. The announcement of the telegraphic information, *via* Zanzibar, in the House of Commons—the "grave and painful" episode—occurred on the 11th of July, the first anniversary of the bombardment of Alexandria. The news of Mr. Shaw's release was despatched from Réunion probably not earlier than the 15th of August. Now, between the 11th of July and the 15th of August there was ample time for the distress produced in England by the intelligence from Tamatave not only to become known in France, but to be communicated thence to Réunion, to which place, as has been shown, Mr. Shaw had by that time been taken.† We do not, of course, presume to say that the officials in Réunion were instructed to find a verdict of not proven; but there can be no

\* The case seems to have been even worse than this, for an eye-witness records that when Mrs. Shaw went on board the Admiral's ship, the *Flore*, orders were sent to guard the port-hole of her husband's cabin on board the *Nièvre* until she was out of sight.

† S. Denis, the chief port of Réunion, can be reached from Tamatave by steamer in forty-five hours.

doubt that there was time enough for them to learn how satisfactory such a result would be not only to England but also to France. Surely we may, from these circumstances, draw the hopeful conclusion that the Government of the Republic has evinced a spirit quite as conciliatory as, if not more conciliatory than, for diplomatic reasons, Mr. Gladstone felt at liberty to announce in detail to the country.

It is not, however, the irritation arising from occurrences connected with a state of war that most troubles us, but the indication the measures so far adopted give of results adverse to the highest interests of Madagascar. Already serious effects have accrued from the action of the French Government. Movements for the consolidation of the administration of the country, for the suppression of disturbances amongst the more distant tribes, for the development of educational and social schemes of improvement have been arrested, and may never be taken up again. Added to this, there has been cultivated a general distrust of Europeans; and the worst of it is, that these three ideas—Europe, civilization, Christianity—are so closely associated in the minds of many of the natives as to be almost inseparable. Undoubtedly there are many intelligent natives who clearly perceive the distinction between these ideas, and whose trust in England has been lately as much increased as their ancient distrust of France has been confirmed; but the bulk of the population are not advanced enough to mark the difference. And when the strange fallacies respecting Madagascar and its people which may frequently be met with in England are remembered, some little lack of fine discrimination on the part of the Malagasy with regard to Europe may be pardoned. This is not the first time that Malagasy forts have been bombarded by European vessels, and those who have lived in Madagascar know what distrust such an act produces in the people. When it is remembered, too, that Mojanga was attacked and taken without any ultimatum having been sent to her late Majesty, it will not be difficult to understand that a feeling stronger than distrust was awakened in the breasts of every patriotic Malagasy. It has been pointed out over and over again that this feeling will have to be reckoned with yet.

Every one who really knows the Malagasy knows that once roused they will fight as doggedly as Mohammedans. Their own proverb has it, "Better be dead than made ashamed." The case may be desperate, but they would rather die than be danced upon; and it has been observed that "desperation is sometimes as powerful an inspiration as genius."

In the meantime there is necessarily some personal risk to those Europeans who remain in the island. So far the danger has come from an unexpected quarter—from the civilized invader rather than the unsophisticated sufferers from invasion—but, unless peace shortly prevails, there may yet be a bad quarter of an hour for the English, Norwegian, and American subjects in the capital. The Government still maintain their hold over the people without any sign of wavering, and there is not the smallest reason to doubt the sincerity of the measures they have adopted for the safety of European lives and property. But it is impossible, in such a severe crisis as the present, to predict with certainty that with the same sincerity they will always have the same success. In every large city there are what may be termed the desperate classes—the more or less lawless and irresponsible people, whose existence is hardly perceived except in times like these. Even London has its "roughs;" Nottingham once had its "lambs;" and light-hearted Paris has not yet forgotten the days of the *pétroleuses*. The fear is lest that should happen in Antananarivo which, under similar circumstances, would be so likely to happen in any civilized metropolis—viz., that after some exceptionally exasperating occurrence the more ignorant mass of the people should become excited and, almost before the central authorities were aware of it, proceed to tumultuous acts; or that, after a series of defeats, a climax should be reached in the fall of the Government. In that case all the Europeans, with their wives and little children, might be exposed to some amount of danger. We do not believe, however, that the risk of anything of this kind happening is great. The precautions taken by the Prime Minister are likely to be effective in case even of a revolution; and in addition, the various nationalities, with Bishop Kestell-Cornish as their chairman, have formed themselves into—not "a virtual Government of National Defence," the title which

the bias of the *Pall Mall Gazette* leads that journal to accept for it—but an Emergency Committee, whose object is to secure united action on the part of the whites in any crisis that may arise. This is a step which, in the absence of all consuls from the capital, it was simply a duty to take without an hour's delay, and we cannot understand why it should be considered a crime to have lived on such friendly terms with the people of the country as not to be required to leave it even now.

The possibility of a tumult in the capital, with an outcry against all whites, is not, however, the cause of our gravest dread. We fear the personal and material risks far less than those which are social, moral, and spiritual. Suppose France should proceed to the bitter end, and determine—expressing latter-day slang in the politer form of antiquity—*aprum consumere totum*? Suppose Madagascar, not through the obstinacy of the late Queen or her successor, and certainly not at the instigation of missionaries, but through the irrepressible patriotism of the people—suppose Madagascar should be willing to accept the two less essential points in the new French ultimatum (relating to the payment of an indemnity and the leasing of land) and absolutely reject any concession whatever affecting the entireness of the kingdom? Suppose that, in that case, France, establishing herself with the aid of a large force first on the coast, eventually yields to the demands of her colonial subjects and, proceeding—not this year, for the season is too far advanced and her troops too few—by the slightly easier but decidedly longer and more unhealthy route from Mojanga, advances on the capital? We are bound to say, in justice to France, that this is a scheme that has so far never been propounded by any responsible statesman, but only by a portion of the press, and apparently also by some of the naval officers. Admiral Le Timbre, who was Admiral Pierre's predecessor, is reported as saying, when in Bourbon (Réunion) on his way home, just before the bombardment of Tamatave, that "Madagascar is essentially a French colony. M. Baudais and Admiral Pierre are going to open the way, and it is for the Bourbon people to occupy it." Admiral Pierre, "grave and discreet" as he is, announced, in his Order of the Day after the occupation of Tamatave, that "we have yet to drive the enemy

out of some refuges which it has found in the interior." A report also comes from Réunion to the effect that Admiral Pierre had asked for 3,000 men as reinforcements for Madagascar, his alleged object being to march on Antananarivo. One account also says that the claim of France includes general rights over the whole island.\* But, though Ministers may not be so rash as to disclose such purposes as these in Paris or London, events rather than announcements certainly point in the direction of France sooner or later becoming practically mistress of Madagascar. If she insists upon her Protectorate of the north-west, and establishes herself there, it is impossible that Madagascar should be divided, and it is inevitable that in time the weaker power should succumb to the stronger. Contingencies may, of course, arise to prevent this, and France may even yet so far modify her claim to a Protectorate as to allay the alarms her proceedings have hitherto created; but looking at the matter reasonably, it is certainly not yielding to unworthy suspicions to assume the possibility of French supremacy in Madagascar.

In that case, what would be the result to the Malagasy from the point of view of the missionary or philanthropist rather than that of the trader or politician? As soon as the terrible social revolution in the country subsided—if, indeed, it ever wholly subsided—there would be established a firm government, which would gradually extend its influence throughout the island. Such matters as sanitation, roads, bridges, railways, manufactories, mining and agriculture, would be attended to; the resources of the country would be developed; the comfort of Europeans increased, and civilization, with all its advantages and disadvantages, would rapidly progress. The natives, excepting those who would be taken away as "apprentices" to the veiled form of slavery existing in Réunion, would be treated according to rigid laws, but probably not with cruelty. The Sovereign and princes and princesses would be pensioned, and amused with flattering but empty attentions.

---

\* The Jesuit Fathers, whose predictions all along have been remarkably correct, said, on quitting the capital to take refuge on the coast, that they would be back again in two months. Unless Antananarivo were in the hands of the French they would need to be brave men to return so soon.

The Protestant missionaries, especially those who have hitherto been most closely associated with the progress of the country, might, if allowed to stay, find their movements jealously watched and hampered with irritating restrictions. If Germany or the United States occupied Madagascar it would not be so; nor would England ever interfere with the Jesuits; but judging by analogy from the account of the condition of affairs in Tahiti, and the recent proceedings at Tamatave, it would be different if France established herself in Madagascar. In Mr. Whitmee's little handbook on Polynesia we read:

"Owing chiefly to jealousy of English influence felt by the French authorities, only one English missionary has been allowed to reside on Tahiti for many years past. He has not been recognized by the French Government as a missionary to the natives, but as minister of the Bethel Church at the Port of Papiete, which is for the benefit of the foreign residents there. . . . An attempt has been made to supply the forced lack of service on the part of English missionaries by the residence of French Protestant agents of the Paris Missionary Society. But the French missionaries have never gained that place in the affections of the people which those who first gave them the Gospel have ever had."\*

Now it would be useless to deny that the English missionaries, if compelled to leave the island, would suffer keenly in the breaking up of many dear and hallowed associations. Some of them have already come to feel as much at home in Madagascar as in their own native land; and, from the interest which successful work so frequently inspires, have been willing, in returning there after furlough in England, to leave their children, and sometimes their wives, behind them rather than not fulfil the wish of the Malagasy that they should return to them. But, though all this is true, that which gives them the greatest grief is the thought that, as it seems to them all too soon, their converts may be left desolate and the years they have spent there wasted. They dread this, not so much on account of what they will be unable to do, as on account of what others may be permitted to undo. They know that many of those who have come under their spiritual influence are as yet but imperfectly instructed and feebly established in the faith. It could not be expected that it should be other-

---

\* "Polynesia: Islands, Races, Missions." By S. J. Whitmee, F.R.G.S.

wise. A spiritual kingdom is God's work, and God works slowly. They know also that there is much yet to be done to evangelize the whole island of Madagascar, and they had hoped at least to participate in this work. Considering that it was Protestant missionaries who first made any impression upon the heathenism of Madagascar; who reduced the language to a written form in the Roman character; who first made its dictionaries and grammars and translated the Scriptures; who may be said practically to have founded both the education and the literature of the country;\* and who alone may claim to have so commended the religion they taught that among their converts were some who witnessed a good confession in the pangs of martyrdom—considering all this, no wonder if they are even passionately grieved, not at the prospect—for they can hardly believe it is so bad as that—but at the bare possibility of such influences being brought to bear upon the Malagasy as, humanly speaking, are calculated to devastate those fields, white already to harvest.

There have not been wanting in Madagascar opportunities of observing marked varieties of native life, differing according to the character and pursuits of the Europeans who predominate in the different localities. In the capital there is much Christianity and little civilization—there are plenty of missionaries and few traders. On the coast there is a little Christianity and plenty of civilization—there are many traders and few missionaries. In the capital there is some approach to sweetness and light; but on the coast there is more of darkness and misery. The reason why so many of the inhabitants of Mauritius and Réunion who come over to Tamatave return

---

\* True, the oldest Malagasy literature is believed to be a catechism published by the Roman Catholic missionaries in 1653; but the efforts of those missionaries in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries had no permanent results. Both missions were abandoned, and no attempts were made to reopen them until the success of the London Society began to attract attention. When English missionaries first went to Madagascar, now more than sixty years ago, they found that none of the natives could read the Roman character, and that any converts the Catholics had made had relapsed into heathenism, or at least had failed to transmit any Christian influence to succeeding generations. It was not until 1878, upwards of 370 years since their work in Madagascar originally commenced, that the Romish Church first published (in a paper cover!) one of the Gospels—St. Matthew—for the use of its converts.

whence they came without a good word for the country and people is probably owing in part to the fact that they never penetrate into the interior, and never therefore see the best side of Malagasy life. Those who do so penetrate and reside for any time in the capital invariably change their views; and it is not assuming too much to say that the missionary element has much to do with the superiority they observe. Indeed, it would be strange if with the number of missionaries labouring in the interior, with their organizations for educational and spiritual work, their printing presses, hospitals, schools, colleges, and training institutions for teachers, some such effect were not observable. The fear now is lest these organizations should be broken up by hindrances placed in the way of those who have superintended them. If other than Protestant missionaries had induced the Malagasy to give up their idols, had to anything like the same extent won the hearts of the people, had realized nearly the same success, had to any appreciable degree affected the religious thought of the country, there might be less strong ground upon which to urge this point; but as a matter of fact, the amount of enlightenment communicated by the Roman Catholic missionaries is comparatively little. Something they have done, it is true. They have got together a brass band for the young men; they have taught the lives of the saints to the little children; and the sisters, in addition to some devoted work as nurses of the sick, have had considerable success with certain forms of fancy needlework, though not greater success than that of the English and Norwegian ladies with every kind of needlework, from plain sewing to elaborate embroideries. But if missionary effort is to be estimated according to its practical utility and elevating force, there can be no doubt that but for the labours of men who happen to be Protestants, both in what those labours have effected and in what they have, by provoking, if not to love, at least to good works, stimulated others to effect, Madagascar would have made but feeble intellectual and spiritual progress.

A little while ago, in studying the foreign words introduced in a native form into the Malagasy language, we took the trouble to tabulate some of those in most frequent use. Deductions arrived at in this way have the advantage of being

independent of mere personal feeling or religious animosity, and certainly the indications of language as to the matters in which one race is most indebted to another are of a very definite character. Accordingly it was instructive to note that while most of the exotic words relating to education and religion came from the English, those derived from the French were principally concerned with wants, vanities and appetites of a grosser nature. Thus, the Malagasy forms of *la cuisine* and many words connected therewith have been derived from the vernacular of M. Soyer. The meal, which may have been cooked in a *poêle*, or a *casserole*, is served on a *table*, to the music of a *serinette*, while the company, provided with *serviettes*, are not seated in native fashion upon the floor, but upon *chaises*. After the *fromage*, the *soupe*, in which are perhaps both *carottes*, and even *choux*, is followed by a variety of dishes, washed down with plenty of *vin*, and then a dessert of *pêches* and other fruit is served. Last of all comes *café* and *thé*, served in a *cafetière*, with small *verres* of *l'eau-de-vie*, and *pipes* or *cigarres* for those who care for them. Perhaps on the next day there may also be for some of the guests a dose of Epsom salts, which the Malagasy, joining the article and noun, call *disely*. In another direction we find such words as *habit*, *gants*, *bas*, *ruban*, and others descriptive of the dress of *femmes* (which word, by the way, is known on the coast-road in a discreditable sense). Their equivalent for *Parliament* is derived from the English, a fact which might indicate that the wicked missionaries had been talking to the natives on forbidden subjects; but then, fortunately, *politique* is also well known and is unquestionably French. On the other hand, the words derived from our own language are such as these:—*book*, *map*, *pen*, *pencil*, *chalk*, *slate*, *lesson*, *class*, *proof*, *square*, *steam*, *press*, *boat*, *print*, *key*, *accent*, *tune*, *bar*, *pulse* and *note* in music, *society*, *good*, *missionary*, *Bible*, and many others.

Having then had so deep an interest in the progress of the Malagasy up to the present time, no wonder if missionaries tremble at the thought that perhaps their very nationality may eventually (as in Tahiti) hinder their further prosecution of the work they have so long successfully and happily, for the people of Madagascar, carried on. To leave the task of enlightening

and uplifting these Malagasy to none but those who have shown themselves unwilling to instruct their minds and unable to win their hearts, is lamentable; and when the spread of irreligion in France is contemplated, the pain and anxiety with which all Christian people have watched events in Madagascar may be understood. To see established in that country French Sundays, French plays, French social customs, French hopeless atheism, leading to that disregard for the sacredness of human life seen in the number of duels and suicides; to see the Republic hating the priests, but using them, and the priests hating the Republic, but willing to become its tools; to see the heart of the country overrun with the same type of foreigners as those who so demoralize the coast; to see the unbelief of modern France, and to see it tempered with superstition; to see infidel principles carried out on Jesuitical methods, and to remember that between the two extremes of abject credulity and blank atheism there lie innumerable varieties of insidious temptation to idolatry or despair—all this is calculated to make the "heart die down." It is possible that this plainness of speech may be not only unpalatable but unintelligible. No one denies the right of France to impress her own individuality—if such a term may be used of a nation—upon the races whom she conquers. But we do most earnestly maintain that it would be a lamentable spectacle to the whole world if in order to do that France should undo the beneficent work of civilization and religion performed by other hands than hers. No one can deny that England has been tender to French susceptibilities and tolerant to the Roman Catholic religion: it is time that tenderness and tolerance should be rewarded with charity and equity. It may be too much to expect that Teutons should be admitted into the Gallic *Fraternité*, but there is a sense in which, in certain distant regions, a trifle of *Liberté* and a *souçon* of *Egalité* might be gracefully dispersed, as they would certainly be gratefully received.

But before anything of the kind can be so much as hoped for, we should expect to see greater carefulness on the part of the French press in accepting information respecting Madagascar. Here, for instance, is what the *Français* said, and the *XIXme*

*Siccle* by quotation endorsed, only the other day:—"The Methodist missionaries in Madagascar exercise an unlimited influence over the Hovas. For some days past it has been affirmed that one of these English ministers, M. Parel, has seized the reins of Government, and has entrusted them to one of these creatures, reserving for himself the position and power of Prime Minister. Père Cazot (Causseque?), a Jesuit, who has just come from Tananarivo, has related this occurrence to me." We must fain admit that there are no "Methodist missionaries in Madagascar," just as there are no Independent missionaries in Fiji. Protestant evangelical missionaries do not care to fritter away their strength in competing with one another on the same ground. Mr. John Parrett, the gentleman who appears to be referred to as "M. Parel," went to Madagascar to superintend the press of the London Missionary Society some twenty-one years ago. For the greater part of that time, as now, he has been the only properly qualified printer in Madagascar, and for the whole of that time his education and ability have given him a position of importance among his colleagues. Some years ago, as the Government required European assistance in selecting, erecting, and working their printing-presses, they naturally turned to Mr. Parrett, as the only suitable man whom they knew, and as one who, knowing the language and people well, would understand their needs, to help them in the matter. By that time the native staff at the mission-press had so far improved that Mr. Parrett was able to undertake, by a little re-adjustment and extra work, a general oversight of the Queen's printers. Proclamations have sometimes to be printed, the contents of which of course must not be divulged before the day of public announcement, and in this way Mr. Parrett is occasionally brought into confidential relations with the Prime Minister. Advice when asked may be given. Representations, always with deference, may occasionally be made; but any attempt to presume upon these relations in order to interfere with the Government of the country would be resented at once, both by Rainilaiarivony himself and by the host of native advisers by whom he is surrounded. Père Cazot, as the head of the Jesuit mission, is in a position to understand this so well that we cannot but believe the atrocious

statement in the *Français* must have been inserted without his knowledge. As to Mr. Parrett becoming Prime Minister, we know from letters received from Antananarivo that it is not a fact, and without those letters, we should know, as Père Cazot knows, that it would be an impossibility.

A writer in the *Revue des Deux Mondes* again makes shipwreck on the same reef, if not on the same rock. He imagines, for instance, that Lord Granville "makes use of the missionaries," who in turn have made themselves "masters, not only of the consciences of the people, but of the Government;" and that "the missionaries of the two religions were not slow in recognizing that the plan of individual conversions would not carry them very far, and that in an autocratic society like that of the Hovas, the master-stroke would be to convert the sovereign." Now no one who has lived in the capital (and no one else can be personally acquainted with typical Malagasy life), unless he allowed himself blindly to accept all that the most virulent and unscrupulous partisans chose to tell him, would really believe that in any sense the missionaries, or any one of them, could keep the Government conscience. No one but a Jesuit would try to do it, and not even a Jesuit would succeed. Indeed, the assumption that the English—and in justice it ought also to be said the Norwegian—missionaries have any political motives whatever in view is a pure mistake. It is not to them that an atmosphere of intrigue is as native air; and it is not they who claim the dominion and rank of a sovereign for their chief functionary. It is simply amusing to hear that Lord Granville "makes use of the missionaries;" while as to the statement that "the missionaries of the two religions" saw that "the master-stroke would be to convert the Sovereign," we regret that we can only answer with a denial for one of the religions referred to; but we are reminded by this and other points in the *Revue* article of the description of Pelleas, and how—

". . . the base man, judging of the good,  
Puts his own baseness in him by default  
Of will and nature."

Whatever may have been attempted by the agents of the other religion, the Protestants certainly cannot claim the credit of

having converted Rànavàlona II.; for the truth is that before the death of her predecessor there were circumstances which made it extremely unlikely that an English missionary would approach the Princess with that or any other object in view; while, after that time and until near the date of her coronation—the occasion upon which her late Majesty first publicly avowed Christianity—the Court was in mourning, and therefore entirely secluded from the visits of Europeans.

The late Queen of Madagascar, Rànavàlona II., furnished a remarkable example of the ennobling influence of a great responsibility. As Ramòma, living an idle, unsatisfactory life, before her accession to the throne, no one saw very much in the future Queen to arouse enthusiasm or inspire praise. But when, on the death of Ràsohèrina, she was proclaimed Queen, she seems, if not at once, at least before the *fisehoana* (or first public appearance) to have risen to the occasion, and become, as it were, a new creature. Unlike her predecessors, her late majesty was most of all unlike Rànavàlona I., for she was as tender-hearted as her great namesake had been cruel. She loved the Christians as much as the old persecutor had hated them, while under her régime the Court, for the first time in the history of Madagascar, was free from the scandalous impurity of former days. Indeed the two Rànavàlonas seemed to have little but their name in common, and certainly so far as regards thoughtful consideration to ameliorate the condition of her people, a dislike of war, an avoidance when possible of capital punishment, a genuine love for little children—to please whom, whether native or European, her Majesty often took no little personal trouble—the late Queen was remarkably different from her predecessors. We have no doubt whatever as to the sincerity of that profession of Christianity, which, made fourteen years ago, has been sustained with unfailing consistency ever since. There have been men in Madagascar who would have been bold enough and malicious enough to attempt to asperse the reputation of the Sovereign, had there been the slightest ground for any charges against her personal conduct. But though such men were to be found, none ever dared to slander the Queen, simply because of her irreproachable character. True she had not always been morally above suspicion, but some

years before her accession a complete change appears to have occurred. At the opening of the Royal Chapel, in 1880, the Prime Minister publicly stated the circumstances under which a greater change still occurred. He said, to translate freely from an account widely circulated at the time :

"If we consider what led the Queen to be religious, it can be truly said that no one led her to be religious, but that it was God Himself who brought her heart to that condition. There is one thing, however, of which I should like to remind you, that you may understand the matter. During the reign of Queen Ràsohèrina, there was a Bible (this which I now show you) which I placed in the house where she lived, and which came to be looked upon as a thing of no account, for any one who could read would take it up, so that it lay about there as a thing of no particular use. On April 3, 1868, when Queen Rànavàlona began to reign, this Bible was still there, and it was freely handled by the people as before. During the mourning for Queen Ràsohèrina, the Queen often read in this Bible—spent her time with it—and even the officers about the Court and the 'twelve youths' (under-secretaries in the Palace) took it up, as they had leisure. And I believe that the reading by the Queen of this Bible was the means by which God disposed her heart to 'pray' to Him, and that it did not come from man."\*

The time has not yet come to sum up all the events of the reign that has just closed ; but when the history of Madagascar is continued to the present day, the most wonderful chapter of all will be that which describes the last fourteen years. The abolition of idolatry, of the poison ordeal, of slave importation and polygamy ; the acceptance of Christianity, the advancement of education, the organization of the Government departments, the amelioration of the condition of the slaves and the lower ranks of the free people, the gradual extension of enlightened ideas enforced by good example, the earnest efforts made by the churches and encouraged by the Queen to evangelize, with native missionaries and native funds, the distant parts of the country—these and many other matters will have to be recorded as conspicuous examples of the noble things accomplished in the golden age of Rànavàlona II.

But although the remarks in the *Revue des Deux Mondes* which gave rise to this digression called for some notice because of the importance of the magazine in which they appeared, it is

---

\* "Teny Son," 1880, p. 74.

far from needful to attempt a reply to the ordinary and extraordinary statements appearing from time to time in the Parisian and colonial press. Rather we prefer, in closing, to add a few words in a somewhat different strain.

It has been a painful task to speak as we have done in this article of the action of France, but the requirements of truth are stern. It would be still more painful to us to feel that any of our readers, upon becoming further acquainted with the bearings of this question, received an impression that the state of affairs in Madagascar was hopeless. Matters have gone far enough, but the aggressive Power could even now, without loss of dignity, so leave the matter as to avoid permanent injury to Madagascar. For it is that most of all that we fear. As to any envy, and especially any jealousy of the influence of France, we cannot, as we have said, too strongly repudiate it. We believe that the English missionaries would feel not only grieved, but positively humiliated, if their own country attempted to annex or protect Madagascar. At the same time we are, above all things, anxious for peace. We certainly do not wish to see Madagascar, or any part of it, conquered by France; yet neither do we desire that France should be humiliated by **any** but a voluntary withdrawal. Let not our friendly relations to the Malagasy be a cause of offence. Let England and France suspect each other less, that they may help each other more. Let the great guns and the deadly mitrailleuses cease their work. Let the war spirit, now thoroughly roused in the Malagasy, be subdued by a spontaneous assurance that the independence of their island shall be maintained. These are our sincerest aspirations, and we might almost add, in similar words to those of *Le grand Corneille*, "O France, if thou complainest that this is to betray thee, make thyself enemies whom we can hate."

We believe also that the English people are glad rather than otherwise to see France turn her attention to colonial extension. But the case of Madagascar is an exceptional one. It is not wholly new ground there, and differs greatly from some barbaric region of Central Africa or island of savages in the Pacific ocean. Waiving for the moment the question of French claims on the north-west coast, it must be remembered that

Madagascar is not a perfectly uncivilized country. If any proof were wanted upon that point, it is furnished in the conduct of Queen Rānavālonā, who, when her people—terribly exasperated on learning of the bombardment of Mojanga without notice—might have attacked the French residents in the capital, yet sent them all under a strong escort to the coast, provided and offered to pay for the bearers, and under heavy penalties protected not only their persons but their property from injury. But this partial civilization has not exactly proceeded upon French lines, but rather has taken an original form, whose development was being watched with interest in Europe. Somehow or other, for the moment it matters not how, France seems unlikely under any circumstances to win the goodwill of the Malagasy people; and without goodwill a healthy government is impossible. Nor is there any reason to suppose that even the coast tribes will, as was stated, make common cause with the invaders, and thus afford, even within a limited area, any more willing subjects. Those who know the wild and treacherous character of the Sakalava, are greatly tickled to hear them spoken of as valuable allies. Besides, even if such an arrangement could be made, it would not last long. France must have either all or none. Sooner or later she would have either to conquer the rest or withdraw; and the question that one sometimes hears now is, Could not France join with the other Powers interested in guaranteeing the independence of Madagascar? That course might at least serve to set at rest any misgivings as to the "perfidious designs" of a nameless Power, it would permit of the peaceful development of the country, and it would furnish an opportunity of proving the truth of the words of the English envoy to the Court of Queen Rānavālonā in his speech to Her Majesty in July, 1881—viz., "that Madagascar possesses in the Hova people a race fit to govern their native land; and the fact obviates the necessity for the intervention of any outside nation."

But, finally, if all our hopes for peace should be shattered and our worst fears realized, we cannot admit that Christianity would perish from the island. The history of the past and the signs of the present alike forbid us to despair. The Church in Madagascar has been already persecuted, but not forsaken;

and it may yet be cast down, but not destroyed. For spiritual death comes not from without but within. It is the result, not of murder, but suicide. The weapons of our warfare are not carnal but spiritual, and therefore cannot be beaten down by material forces. Neither armies nor edicts gave Madagascar her Christianity, and neither armies nor edicts can take it away from her. The Hovas were Christians before the Queen—indeed the feeling in favour of Christianity was so strong that her late Majesty's immediate predecessor, Ràsohèrina, although herself a heathen, granted complete toleration for it. Those Malagasy tribes who have actually renounced their idolatry have done so less from loyalty to their Sovereign than from loyalty to conscience. There are distant corners of the central provinces where, to this day, not even royal decrees have sufficed to abolish superstitious practices. When, therefore, Rànavàlona II. avowed her Christianity, she was but anticipating the longings of those who had placed her on the throne; and when she burnt her idols they joyfully did the same. Christianity in Madagascar is a great popular movement, and all great and permanent national movements take their rise amongst the people. They are not merely decreed from above; they spring up from beneath, and only when they do so are they likely to reach every class. It has been so in Madagascar; or rather, beginning from beneath, it has been met halfway from above. Christianity, in her progress through Madagascar, received first the greetings of the multitude with one hand, and then with the other accepted the homage of the Crown. Uniting, as she has done, the throne and the people, Christianity, speaking only humanly, cannot be easily overthrown; and we have good reason to doubt if any sovereign adverse to Protestant Christianity could maintain the throne.

Whatever happens then, we believe that it will be only the organizations—the mere machinery, the men and the measures—that can, at the very worst, be destroyed. But God is independent of men and machinery, and in the looms of His providence can weave the raw material into the most beautiful and ethereal fabrics. So at least it has already been in Madagascar. Sixty-three years ago a few Welshmen began mission-work there, and after about sixteen years of chequered

labour they were practically banished the country. Violent persecutions from time to time broke out. Some of their converts were put to death; others were exiled in chains to distant and unhealthy districts; many literally "wandered in deserts and in mountains, and in dens and caves of the earth;" and the rest could only by stealth and in great fear, meet to sustain each other's faith by the sympathy and encouragement of Christian fellowship. How all this would be calculated to deter waverers from avowing their Lord needs no saying; and yet after six-and-twenty years of isolation from European teachers, when the mission was reopened in 1862, it was found that in spite of all the martyrdoms, wanderings, and terrorism of those "dark days" (as the natives still call them), the number of those who professed Christianity was twenty times as many as before the night of persecution had fallen around them.

And if in the near future it should be the lot of the Church in Madagascar to pass through less fiery, but not less dangerous because more subtle, temptations to apostasy than before, we cannot believe that the temptations themselves will be beyond what the sufferers are able to bear. The missionaries have laid the foundation, even Jesus Christ, upon whom they have been building a spiritual house of living stones. Because He lives they shall live also. They shall be as jewels in His crown; as gold tried in the fire; the silver shall not become dross. True, some may go out from the Church, because they never were of it, but only in it. Weak places in human work are always liable to occur, and these shall assuredly be found out. "The fire shall try every man's work of what sort it is." But the strong points shall also be brought out by the same means. The wood, hay, and stubble will be consumed; but the gold, silver, and precious stones shall abide. Perhaps only thus can the Church be fully purified from much that is unworthy in it. Undoubtedly only by such a crisis as this will the brightness and purity of the faith and love of many be made manifest. But for this we might never know how much "gold" there is in Madagascar. "It shall be revealed by fire."

---

## ART. VII.—THE LUTHER FESTIVAL: DR. PHILIPPI.

1. *Friedrich Adolf Philippi: ein Lebensbild aus der Lutherischen Kirche der Gegenwart.* Von D. LUDWIG SCHULZE, Nördlingen. 1883. (*A Memorial Tribute from the Lutheranism of the Present Time.*)
2. *Real Encyclopädie für Protestantische Theologie und Kirche.* Band XL. Leipzig. 1883.

WHILE we write, Protestant Germany is absorbed by one object, how best to commemorate the four hundredth anniversary of the birth of Luther. No commemoration of our time has awakened more enthusiasm; none at least has been diffused over a wider variety of classes. Luther is to the German people what hardly any other man is to any other people. It is scarcely possible to define the relation he bears to them, or their relation to him; it is a relation that has no parallel. The celebration of the year will unite almost the whole empire. Of course, the Roman Catholic part of it think the name of Luther synonymous with the wildest outbreak of Rationalism, regarding him as the leader of the host of modern rebels against the faith once for all delivered to the Church. They will not be found in the ranks of the multitudes who keep the feast. But even they, in their secret heart, will not be without a certain sympathy with the movement; they will hardly be able to forget that in Luther which made him the typical German; and will find something to commemorate as men, though as Catholics they will have to suppress the feeling. As to all others, the charm is and will be unanimous. Judging by the scale of the preparation now going on, it will be a wonderful jubilee; perhaps the most enthusiastic known in our generation.

Nor will it be confined to Germany. Wherever the Reformation of the sixteenth century is valued, the occasion will be celebrated as the birthday of the first leader, with scarcely a second of the great uprising against ancient superstitions. But here there will be much variety in the measure of enthusiasm. Many good Protestants of the school of Calvin remember the original differences which so deeply divided the two leaders of the Reformation: differences which are perpetuated in a multitude of

doctrinal and ecclesiastical memorials. Among ourselves the Luther festival will occasion many searchings of heart. English Churchmen, who disavow the Reformation and hate the name of Protestantism, will take the opportunity to furbish up the weapons with which they have been wont to assail the character of the recreant monk ; and it will be well if Great Britain does not send out some notes of shrill discord to vex the German mind. And others, who have not a spark of this spirit, will nevertheless carry their polemics into the celebration, and remember perhaps too keenly the points in which the Lutheran form of Christianity failed of being a thorough reformation, and retained too much of the system it displaced. But the great majority of English Christians will rise above all such considerations, and suffer nothing to abate the honest human congratulation and profound thankfulness to God for the gift of Martin Luther to mankind. With few lives in the history of the Christian Church were more tremendous issues bound up. But November has not yet come ; and we are writing too early for anything like a chronicle or estimate of the Luther festival. Meanwhile, there lies before us a most interesting memoir of one who may be regarded as a typical Lutheran divine ; whose whole life indeed was a practical, straightforward assertion of the principles of the Lutheran Reformation, in an age when the tendency was to call those principles in question and more or less recede from them. We have been in the habit of memorializing in these pages the most eminent German theologians as they have one after another passed away, and we have special reasons for paying this tribute to the late Dr. Philippi.

Friedrich Adolf Philippi was born on October 15, 1809. The son of a Jewish banker in Berlin, he was trained in a kind of transitional Judaism, which had lost its old rigour and boasted of a rationalistic latitudinarianism. He early became a captive of those intense spiritual feelings which profoundly moved the German people about the time of the War of Independence. The schools to which he was sent were Christian schools ; and it is evident that he heard the voice of his Saviour calling him at a very early period. When, in his twelfth year, he became a "son of the law," and received the special instruction usually given at that age, he was more than half a Christian. His own

household condemned his bias, but could give him nothing to satisfy his desires. He studied in Berlin and Leipzig; became a doctor of philosophy in his twenty-second year; and about the same time made the great change from Judaism to Christianity. Many Christian teachers helped him; but Neander, who had himself passed through the same crisis in early life, was his most effectual helper. He had known every stage of the bitter process—the persecution of home, the threat of disinheritance, and the terrible wrench from all that a young man holds dear—and he knew how to guide the young convert. His expositions of the Epistles of St. Paul were very useful to young Philippi, on whom the Apostle's transition from the Law to the Gospel made a profound impression. But above all other voices he heard one, "Come unto Me, all ye that are burdened and heavy laden, and I will refresh you; ye shall find rest unto your souls." These words went with him to Leipzig; there also he found faithful pastors provided by Providence; and at the Christmas festival of 1829 he received baptism and his first communion. Christmas-tide was always afterwards a peculiarly precious festival to Philippi. How this event affected his family we must let Dr. Schulze tell us in his own pages.

The early part of his history has its own interest; but we have no space to follow his career step by step. After teaching classics and philosophy in Dresden and elsewhere, he returned to Berlin, where he fell under the inspiring influence of Hengstenberg, and renewed his fellowship with Neander. It was the former who first urged him to dedicate himself to theology, and who, far more than Neander, moulded his early theological character. But Philippi was from the very outset an independent, and, in some sense, self-taught theologian. His Judaism he carried with him in a sense in which Neander did not. Neander came into Christianity with a strong infusion of Platonism, and was to a great extent under the spell of Schleiermacher. Philippi was never attracted by these master spirits of ancient and modern mysticism. He was, like Luther, driven to Christ by the sting of the law; and, though he found perfect peace in Him who was "the end of the law," he never forgot the pangs which Rom. vii. describes. His theology was from the beginning shaped, like Luther's, by the great antithesis between law and gospel.

Never was German more entirely swayed by this antithesis ; his Christianity and his Lutheranism were one in their principles.

What these fundamental principles were, Philippi had occasion in 1841 to announce. Receiving a call to the University of Dorpat, he was required to send a programme of his religious belief. Some sentences we may select as giving evidence of a certain stiffness amounting almost to bigotry in his earlier views, as well as for the sake of showing how thorough must have been the revival of true Christianity in Germany when such a programme was required and accepted. "The centre of all the revelations of God is the fact of the redemption through Christ. The collective fulness of the whole system of revealed truth, preparing for Christ and sealed in Him, as also the infallible interpretation of its substance and end, is guaranteed in the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments, and surely, plainly, clearly described in them. These two fundamental truths form the one bond of faith of the Christian Church in all ages ; and are the absolute principles of the Evangelical Church, whose peculiar difference from other Church communities consists simply in the exclusiveness of these principles." We shall not pause to consider whether or not this assertion is too sweeping ; suffice that the "Evangelical," that is, the Lutheran, Church was by no means the monopolist of these principles. His confession of faith contains some very sweeping strictures on the separated communities which always have been the offence of Lutheranism. Philippi was disposed to be very unfair to the blessed communities which, when he formed his principles, were doing the best work of Christianity in his fatherland. He, himself, owed much to his intercourse with Gossner and others ; but always maintained a certain severity towards every form of religion, and every kind of religious discipline, which, in his judgment, interfered, or tended to interfere, ever so little with the one great principle, that salvation is matter of faith alone.

In Dorpat, Philippi became acquainted with Sartorius, of Königsberg. His colleagues were, among others, Keil and Ullmann, and with them he spent ten of the happiest years of his life. His first lectures extended over a wide field, being based on a number of textbooks, as the manner was in those days. Dogmatics, Ethics, Symbolics, Ecclesiastical History, Historical Theology, Exegesis

of the New Testament—all came within his province. It was a term of unlimited activity. The University was happy in being of one mind as to the Lutheran Confessions, at least as to essentials. Philippi had only to build on the foundations which Sartorius had laid before him, and to keep pace with the indefatigable Keil in his exertions on the Old Testament. It was during this time that he published the "Commentary on the Romans," by which chiefly he is known to our readers, through the clear and faithful translation executed by Mr. Banks. His qualifications for this great task were of the highest order. In fact, exegetical theology was the department of his professional function in which he took greatest delight, and for which he was best fitted. His acquaintance with Hebrew was, if not profound, thorough so far as it went. This was, as it were, his vernacular tongue, and he had subsequently received the best instruction in Rabbinical literature. His masters in Greek had been Boeckh and Hermann, the greatest teachers of the day. New Testament Greek had engaged his later attention, when he turned his thoughts to theology. He was well versed in Biblical antiquities and history. But, above all, he had an indestructible conviction of the divinity of the Word of God. It was to him the eternal truth, spoken in human language; and this strong faith was an immense advantage, as giving him a boundless confidence that Scripture would defend itself and reward all investigation. The Epistle to the Romans was his elect book in Holy Scripture. He expounded many other books in his popular lectures, especially the programme of St. John's Gospel, which was published and much approved. But the great Epistle of St. Paul he valued above all, not as being the Scripture within the Scripture, but as being the most essential compendium of Scriptural truth, the unity of the two Testaments, and the summary of all mediatorial teaching. In short, he regarded it as the supreme authority for the Reformation, and the very sheet-anchor of the Church of modern times. On this exposition he spent many years. The second and the third editions were in due time called for, and each shows how diligently he studied the progress of exposition on this subject.

German learning has contributed many profound commentaries on the Epistle to the Romans, and monographs on several portions of it. Fritzsche, Meyer, and Rückert have applied to it the

highest philological and grammatical refinement of criticism; De Wette a remarkable penetration and unity of purpose; Olshausen and Tholuck an abundance of historical and practical material. But Philippi's is distinct from all these, having most of their good qualities and something not found in any of them. It is always and absolutely faithful to the inspired authority of Scripture, and to the principles of evangelical truth. It does justice to Calvinism, but is not Calvinistic. It avoids obtruding the individual notions of the commentator, who scarcely ever speaks in his own person as such. If it has any fault, it is one that its author counted its highest praise, that it makes the Lutheran Confessions the standard of interpretation. These are his own words:—

“It yet remains as a task to appropriate for the *Church* the thorough investigations and results of recent times—for the Church which is founded on the Word of God, and has grown out of the Epistle to the Romans, as the kernel and centre of that Word. That Church appeals with steadfast energy, and in the sure consciousness of a profession given of God and never to be lost, to her own pure and simple apprehension of the words of Holy Writ. Then she is, in an important measure, concerned with the question how far the advanced knowledge of the laws of language, and the results of a corresponding advancement in the art of exposition, accord with her understanding of that apostolic Epistle, the teaching of which is the centre of her whole circle of faith, the foundation on which, and with which, her whole superstructure stands or falls—the Epistle to the Romans, namely, which is rightly termed the *clavis et methodus universæ Scripturæ*.”

It may be open to question whether of any particular document in revelation these last words ought to be said. The Scriptures are one whole, of which each component element is only part. Doubtless it is impossible to exaggerate the importance of St. Paul's greatest Epistle; none of its expositors has said more than the truth in its praise; none, even Philippi or Godet, has used words which we do not willingly accept with reference to its independent value, as in some sense the masterpiece of the mediatorial theology. But we may doubt whether the last word is found in it as to some of the doctrines and much of the phraseology of the New Testament. Full as its teaching on the Reconciliation is, there are passages in the Epistles to the Ephesians, Corinthians, and Hebrews, and in the First of St. John, which are equally fitted to give the norm of the doctrine, and

some which rather explain the Roman texts than are explained by it. Righteousness, again—the keynote of the Epistle—is not perfectly and in all its aspects set forth: St. James and St. John also here claim to be heard. The connection of righteousness with sanctification is far from being exhausted in it: the Epistle to the Hebrews must bring its contribution. And we cannot help feeling, in the exposition of most of the Lutheran expositors, that the Epistle to the Romans is regarded too much as passing, by a transition which the Apostle does not mark, from an external justification to an internal sanctification. Moreover, the Christian regeneration is not as fully exhibited here as in some other parts of the New Testament. On the whole, we see no reason for taking this document as the sole key to Christian theology. And, in saying this, we are not retracting the praises bestowed on Philippi's noble exposition.

During this period honours were abundantly showered on him. The Russian authorities distinguished their German divine by certain peculiar State-Church dignities. But that which he prized most was “the highest distinction that a theologian can attain, the degree of Doctor in Divinity.” It was given him by the Erlangen Faculty, in 1843; and was acknowledged in a letter of singular grace, in which occur these words: “As I regard this honour as coming not from man, but from the Lord of the Church through man, it is to me rather a consecration and strengthening to future work than a seal upon work already done.” The dignity came to him at a time when his energies were taxed in rather a troublesome way, for all was not perfectly smooth in the Baltic provinces. Rationalism was far from being defunct, while the Schleiermacher theology and the Moravian Pietism found in Livonia a stronghold. Philippi's panacea was the revival and revivification of the Lutheran Confessions: to bring these to their due prominence was his one great endeavour. The unity of the Church, based upon this Confession, seemed to have been his ideal. Pietistic separation he contended against with all his might. But the Greek Church, the rights and prerogatives of which in the Russian provinces were of course upheld by the State, gave him still more trouble. In 1832 the equality of the Lutheran and the Greek Churches was interfered with. Several attempts were made to win over the peasantry to

the old "orthodox" communion. Philippi had to resist these, and to engage in a polemical defence of Lutheranism. His utterances brought him into collision with St. Petersburg. But these are matters of local history, from which we must pass away, though their effects were permanent. Russian Lutheranism along the Baltic coast was almost refashioned by him; and it is probable that no one man ever exerted a more lasting and salutary influence in any one country than this reviver of Lutheranism did in Livonia.

These ten years in a foreign land passed, and Philippi found his way back to Germany. The University of Rostock gave him a call. It was hard to break away from a home of so much happiness and usefulness. The Courland Synod sent him an earnest request to remain, feeling that the little oasis of Russian Lutheranism would suffer an irreparable loss through his departure. But he had done his work, and fought his battles manfully; his growing family wanted something other than Russian training. He accepted the call. Some of his old pupils presented him a golden crucifix and a Lutheran Bible—a Lutheran combination that may seem strange to us; and the Livonian Synod took farewell of him in an address. The plague of Rationalism had long desolated Mecklenburg, his new sphere. It had been hardly stayed by the labour of such men as Kliefoth and Hofmann and Delitzsch. The number of students was small. He had little sympathy with his earliest colleagues, among whom accuracy and decent formality were all in all, and who shrank from his vehement and enthusiastic assertion of confessional principles. His scanty college classes did not satisfy Philippi, and he seems to have found a peculiar solace in those more public lectures which he calls his *Bibelstunden*. In adopting this method of usefulness, he followed an example that had been set by some of the most eminent professors, and is continued to the present day in Germany, France, and Switzerland. We have in England some good instances; but among us the valuable agency of the public lecture is too seldom employed by the men who are most fitted to command attention. It is the habit to speak slightly of these attempts to popularize dogmatic and controversial theology. But none despise them whose judgment is of any value. Some of the best known

translations from the German and French are of this class; and we believe the day is fast coming when the necessities of society will demand that professors of theology shall be able to make their best learning and experience bear upon this kind of public assertion and maintenance of the faith.

Two controversies of the gravest importance involved the Professor of Rostock—as Philippi is now generally called—in common with the other zealous champions of the revived Lutheran confessional theology. The aggressors or opponents in these controversies were men of no less distinction than Michael Baumgarten and J. K. von Hofmann, both of them, in their way, earnest Lutherans of the revival, but disposed to go out of the usual theological track, and to carry the mystical tone of sentiment into religion too much. Our readers know the name of the former better than that of the latter; and what they know of his works on Zechariah and the Acts of the Apostles would hardly prepare them to hear that he was dismissed from the professorship of theology in Rostock on account of heresy. The consistory, on the instigation of Kliefoth and Krabbe, and with the concurrence of Philippi, instituted a process which issued in his deprivation. His theology was charged with being “negative, subjective, spiritualistic, pelagian, antinomistic, millenarian; in fact, a confused medley of latitudinarian fantasies and extravagant theosophy.” The whole matter was a very sore trial to Philippi. Baumgarten’s principles were certainly mystical and millenarian, and therefore opposed to the Augsburg Confession; but it was a perilous thing to impeach a man’s orthodoxy on that account. However galling that was, it was still worse to brand him with Antinomianism; for his principles were precisely those which Philippi held dear, though carried too rashly to their legitimate conclusion. Baumgarten pleaded hard; defended himself by many a pamphlet; but all in vain. He was silenced; and rambled up and down Germany a blighted man, only too ready to give the sanction of his name to the free thought of the *Protestantenverein*. More tenderness might have saved him; but the Rostock Lutherans had no mercy on the teacher who pushed their own Lutheran tenets to extremes.

The other controversy was of more importance, though Philippi had only the common interest in it. Dr. Schulze passes it over

with few words, because it lay beyond his subject. To us it seems that it touched the essence of all Philippi's work : revealing both the strength and the weakness of his theological system. Von Hofmann was professor of theology in Erlangen, and had just published his dogmatic system under the title of *Schriftbeweis* : a title which indicated that it was his object to defend the theology of Lutheranism by an appeal rather to Scripture as a whole than to the Confessions. It is the most remarkable body of divinity extant ; basing the doctrines of the Gospel on a most searching, learned, and fearless examination of the Old and New Testaments taken as a whole. His treatment of the atonement and justification roused the most intense opposition everywhere among the New Lutherans, and excited most their distrust who agreed with him most entirely in devotion to the Reformation. The sum of his offence was that he could not accept the Anselmic doctrine of a strictly vicarious substitution and the satisfaction offered to Divine justice ; that he denied any reconciliation in God and limited it to man ; and that he refused to admit the direct imputation of Christ's righteousness to the believer. Philippi was one of the first who entered the lists ; and none who followed him put the Lutheran case more strongly or convincingly than he did. The controversy was prolonged for years, and has never been settled in Germany : nor anywhere else : it is the abiding question of all Christendom, and appears under various disguises in all communions. Anselm and Abælard represented it in the Middle Ages, and since that day it has never died out.

It might be assumed that we should go further, and speak of Philippi's great service in the cause of truth, and congratulate the Lutheran Church on such a champion. This is what we would fain do : it is a sore thing that we have any reserve or qualification on the subject. But so it is. We are with both sides and belong to neither alone. Undoubtedly it is unfashionable to say this ; decision is always desiderated on such fundamental questions. But it is not desirable here ; to us it seems impossible to side with either party. Nor is it necessary. The truth is independent of both ; and they are very foolish who link it with the formularies or the formulæ of any particular party. We may disagree with Philippi and yet not hold altogether with Hofmann ;

we may see errors in Hofmann without going for their correction to Philippi. For ourselves, we would avoid the errors of both; considering them as their errors, but thinking of our own times and our own theologians. Hofmann protested against the juridical idea of the substitutionary death of the Redeemer, in the sense that He took our place before the bar of eternal justice, and endured the strict chastisement, or the strict equivalent of the chastisement, of sinners. In this he was right; and Philippi, with the Calvinists on his side, was wrong: Philippi, and the Lutherans, not being predestinarians, found it very hard indeed to reconcile this theory with the redemption of the whole race. They could not meet their opponents, who steadfastly maintained that the atonement was as valid for the lost of mankind as for the saved. On the other hand, Hofmann was wrong in going to the opposite extreme, and limiting the atoning passion to its exhibition of the love of the Father and the Son, and making its influence simply and purely moral. Similarly, Hofmann in Germany, and multitudes of sound divines outside of Lutheranism and Calvinism, rightly rejected the immediate and direct imputation of the righteousness of Christ as the formal cause of justification; but he was wrong, and many among ourselves are also wrong in leaping to the conclusion that there is no other righteousness for man than that which is wrought in Him by the Spirit. The objective righteousness of our freedom from condemnation is necessary, and will be necessary for ever; that is secured by the judicial sentence which for Christ's sake sets us "free from the law of sin and death." But the subjective righteousness of the law is to be "fulfilled in us;" and eternal justice will not accept any for Christ's sake who are not inwardly conformed to the law through the Spirit of the Just One infused into the justified and making them just. Here is our solution of the controversy which occupied so much of Philippi's life. And this is one plea, on the fourth centennial anniversary of Luther's birth, against the exaggerations of Lutheranism.

Of much more importance than the controversial pamphlets of this period was the final form given at Rostock to the theological lectures which Philippi had made the chief work of his life. The title he gave the work was suggestive. It was the "*Kirchliche Glaubenslehre*;" a title not easily translated, which signifies the

Doctrine of the Faith as taught in the Church. It is a great book, and worthy to be placed at the head of German systems of theology. But it must remain "German," for it requires to be read with the Lutheran Confessions open by the side of it, makes them the standard, and contains an overwhelming amount of minor Lutheran controversy. It is not to be compared with a similar work of Thomasius for simplicity and patristic learning; but then Thomasius makes his starting-point the Incarnation as interpreted by a theory of depotentiation. Of other rivals we need not now speak; the works of Nitzsch, Dorner and Sartorius have been already discussed in our pages. Philippi's point of departure is the idea of Christianity as the restoration of man's fellowship with God in and through Christ; objectively through the atoning revelation of God in His Son, and subjectively through the faith of man wrought by the Spirit. Hence the great divisions are the original fellowship with God, its interruption by sin; its restoration through the atonement; its realization in man through faith; the means of grace; the church; the final consummation of the renewed fellowship. The fourth, fifth and sixth are confused through their separation from each other; a separation demanded by the Lutheran solicitude to make the sacraments in a pre-eminent and peculiar sense the means of grace. Having given this work a careful reading, we are able to say of it that if any book would make a man honour the theology of the Reformation era, whether in its Confessions or in its dogmatic divines, this is the book. But there is this drawback—that it makes fearfully emphatic the differences between the two great divisions of that theology, and greatly undervalues the Arminian reaction against both.

But now we must mark the end of this indefatigable and faithful Lutheran, who finished his work as he began. Over fifty years of comparatively peaceful and successful labour he could look back with thankfulness that he had surrendered no one of the evangelical principles with which he set out. Whatever else he had been able to do, he had succeeded in setting before the theological world of Germany an example of consistency. Not one among all his fellow-labourers had kept so close to the line marked out by the confessions and dogmatists of the sixteenth century. If they were right he was right; where they were

wrong, he was content to be wrong with them. He regarded the Lutheran testimony as the voice of the Holy Spirit recalling Christendom to truth long forgotten, and, so far as regards the fundamental verities of the Faith, he regarded that testimony as having a character of finality. This last principle was almost peculiar to him. Among the noble band of his coadjutors there was scarcely one who had not thought himself called to develop some germ in the Confessions to which justice had not been done. Almost all had been fascinated by the thought that theological science had the function to finish the imperfect work of the Reformation. The most numerous and most vigorous of his compeers had attached themselves to the ranks of what is known as the mediation-theology: a theology which aimed at giving to the Confessions what belonged to them, and restoring to reason some of its neglected rights. And among the teachers of his own school—the new Lutherans—this tendency had shown itself. Sartorius, Baumgarten, Olshausen for instance, had gone off into the mystical and millenarian lines, in flagrant contradiction to some of the Augsburg articles. Kahnis was but one of many who introduced low views on the inspiration of Scripture, and the interior relations of the Trinity. Thomasius and Liebner, the nearest to Philippi in other respects, had brought their science to bear upon the mystery of the Incarnation, left by the Confessions in its unfathomable mystery, and had startled the Churches by new theories of the self-limitation of the Divinity in the Son without the bounds of human nature. Stier and many others had worked up the theory of the second sacrament into a systematic doctrine of which the Confessions scarcely gave the germ. Delitzsch had clothed his Lutheranism with a strange garb of theosophy. Hengstenberg had roused deep suspicion by views of the doctrine of imputed righteousness, which pleased the Romanisers more than they pleased the Evangelicals. In short, there were very few who had been content to expound the old articles without expanding them. But Philippi was one of these. He was the typical Lutheran, and as such we have regarded him in this year of the Lutheran festival.

In death he clung to the Lutheran formularies. His last confession before the Lord's Supper was a remarkable one. The minister was about to utter it for him, supposing him to be

too weak to utter it himself. But the dying man took up the Catechism Confession with a clear voice, and then poured out his testimony in prayer: "I shall enter heaven, for I have never rested on the pillow of self-righteousness, but only on the merit of my adorable Saviour. I have acknowledged Jesus in life, and I will acknowledge Him in death. This is my last testament, that before God nothing avails but the righteousness of Jesus Christ alone." This was his last emphatic confession, both as a sinner and as a divine. He then prayed long for the Church, and again the ruling passion was heard: "Accursed be all modern deceits which would bury the living Church of Christ. I will know nothing of Synergism, nor of the Kenosis of the Logos; nothing of the teaching of those who say that they have to develop the doctrine of our Church. God's word and our Confessions; nothing below and nothing above these. All this is easily said, but to hold fast this faith in death, that is the task."

It would not be right in these pages to describe the final scene. Hymns, prayers, exhortations, all tended the same way; there was something pathetically polemic in everything down to the end, and those who think that at such a time all his Lutheranism should have been lost in his Christianity forgot that to Philippi his Church was as dear as his own soul. During his last days he would have the proceedings of the Conference in Schwerin read to him, and eagerly asked about everything from his son, who came from it. The day before he died he appeared, in his half conscious state, to be addressing that assembly; was heard distinctly to say, "All theses which are not clearly grounded in the word of God must be rejected." The rest was a broken exhortation to unity in spirit. In fact, the man died as he had lived—putting the cause of God even before his own soul. But those who demur to such a polemical kind of exit will be soothed by finding that when the end came, his words were, "One drop of that precious Blood!" "How beautiful, how beautiful!" and "Lord, Jesus, Mercy!" In these words all the faithful of every creed join at the last, laying aside at that supreme moment all their controversies about the ground of acceptance, and resting only on One!

Since writing these pages we have received the eleventh

volume of the great Protestant German Theological Cyclopædia, a work which may itself be regarded as a noble tribute to the memory of Luther and the Reformation. This second edition is not yet near its conclusion, and it is a work that cannot be hastened. Had it been possible to finish it this season, it would have been perhaps the best of all the monuments of this festal year. We find in it an admirable account of Dr. Philippi, written by his son, which, however, adds little to our sketch, and suggests no alteration in it. Our reason, however, for alluding to the Encyclopædia is the evidence it affords that the cause of true Christianity and of orthodox theology is advancing throughout the land of Luther. That such a work as this should prosper as it does is itself a most cheering fact, and an omen of good for the future. But as we track it volume after volume, we cannot but perceive tokens that the days of rigid Lutheran orthodoxy are approaching their close. The old champions are dying out; and their place is taken by a more flexible race, who will widen more and more the latitude of the *mediation theology*. The volume we are now referring to contains an article by Burger—a worthy name—on "Orthodoxy." From it we translate and condense a few sentences, of much significance for the celebration of this year :

"The Reformation gave a new turn to things. When the Protestants of Germany, pressed from within and from without, combined their doctrines into symbolical writings, and laid them before the public criticism, they constrained all other Churches and parties to do the same. The sixteenth century was the century of the Confessions, and the *seventeenth that of Orthodoxy*. In the Churches of the Reform, especially those of Germany, the Church doctrine became the centre of life; everyone was theologically moulded, to take part in definitions of dogma. Pulpits and chairs were emulous in exciting this disposition, and the Churches would have it so. And the Roman Catholic, or rather Jesuit, orthodoxy carried on its conflict with Jansenism; and even the specifically "orthodox" Church of the East was roused from its apathy by Cyril Lucar, and framed its doctrine in the Confession of Peter Mogilas."

Then follows—for we cannot quote at large—a noble vindication of the dogmatic fidelity of the early Lutheran divines, so often charged with hair-splitting subtilty. "Pure doctrine was the treasure, and as it were *charisma*, of our Church; its earnest endeavour to exhibit the truth, the logical harmony, the internal

consistency of that doctrine, deserves warm acknowledgment, as it undeniably still bears its good fruits." The vigour of the catechetical instruction, though quickened and popularized by Spener, owes much to that earlier orthodoxy. And the theological students of the present time are recommended to begin their studies by a close examination of those old orthodox dogmatists, whom even Lessing held in respect. But then came the danger of false and dead orthodoxy, a *Pharisaism* as denounced by our Lord. In the eighteenth century heterodoxy also had its triumph. But it was stayed by the secret influence of those old dogmatists. Not by Pietism, nor by Supernaturalism, was the barrier erected against the sceptical spirit and the Schleiermacherian sentimentalists, but by the abiding power of the ancient dogmatist divines, still living in a century which strove to cast them off. But then comes the application to the present :

"We do not mean, however, the literal repristination of the seventeenth century. The orthodoxy of the present must and *will* endure a quite different degree of heterodoxy within the Church. Fidelity of the mere letter, painful and slavish subjection to symbol, narrow-hearted hunting down of heretics, have had their day ; no one among us dreams of renewing them. The Christology of Thomasius and Dorner, the atonement doctrine of Hofmann and Philippi, the justification theories of Hengstenberg and Frank, the eschatology of Kliefoth and Luthardt, and many other differences of doctrinal statement, have in the Church room enough to dwell together. What a free posture as to the canon is taken by Kahnis and the editors of the last edition of the Calw Bible ! It is not on that account a dishonourable peace. One is attacked, and defends himself ; such conflicts are often lively and violent ; but the opponents are on both sides orthodox at bottom, their deviations from the Church doctrine in individual points notwithstanding."

This admission fairly expresses the general sentiment of modern Lutheranism. But it avows such a resignation to latitudinarianism as Philippi and the Lutherans of his school deprecated with all their might. And no one can read the Confession to which the communities founded by Luther are pledged without feeling that strict consistency and integrity are on the side of those older Lutherans. They held with unfaltering tenacity the two great principles : that holy Scripture is the test of all religious truth, and that righteousness is of faith alone. The former they called the formal principle, the latter the material

principle, of the Reformation. Philippi and his fellows, in our judgment, were far too rigorous in their interpretation of the latter; so rigorous indeed as to bring the two principles into collision. If Holy Scripture is to be the sole standard of appeal, then their doctrine of the imputation of Christ's active and passive righteousness to the believer is, if not erroneous, yet so doubtful as to be unfit to become an article of binding confession. Those Lutheran divines are better advised who allow some freedom of thought on this subject. But Dr. Berger feels the danger; and he closes his interesting paper on the subject by opening to our view a vista which goes beyond the present tolerance of rival views. It is pleasant enough to think of the general agreement to tolerate all kinds of views that are not flagrantly inconsistent with the Confessions. But what if the views are in some cases diametrically opposed to them?

"There is another conflict which has been long going on, concerning which it must be matter of doubt whether the combatants can remain on the common Christian territory, or whether it will not pave the way for the last division in Christendom itself. The question here is not about a varying view and exhibition of various individual doctrines, not of the holding fast or relinquishing certain dogmatic Church positions. It concerns two different notions of the universe of truth, which are more sharply contrasted than were ever heresy and the Catholic truth: *two religions*, in fact, we may call them. When, under the pretence of expanding and morally improving Christianity, men cut the nerve of its dogmatic teaching; when they substitute for the essential divinity of Christ His human uniqueness; when, instead of the normative authority of Holy Scripture they appeal to the fleeting consciousness of the Church;—then are we outside of the distinction between orthodoxy and heterodoxy; the very existence of our confessional Churches is at stake; and new forms of religious fellowship must come in which will accomplish the predictions of the last phase of the history of the kingdom of God."

The future of Lutheranism is matter of profound interest to every faithful servant of the Lord Jesus. It has many difficulties to overcome; but not more than it has overcome in times past. Never were its universities on the whole so faithful to Christian learning; and never was the Holy Scripture more profoundly studied in its ancient and modern documents than now. There are diffused over Germany as many divines true to the essentials of the Reformation as in any country of Protestant Christendom; we were going to say as many of the Philippi

type, but that would be going too far. Within a certain limit, the freedom of these divines from the strict letters of the Lutheranism which he represented is an advantage and a hopeful sign, if only they will recede from the one-sided view of the "material principle," without receding at the same time from the great mass of essential truth. In this year of festival, however, sinister augury is out of place. And we most heartily pray for the peace and prosperity of Lutheran Christianity.

## SHORT REVIEWS AND BRIEF NOTICES.

## THEOLOGY.

*Sermons on Christian Life and Truth.* By JOHN BURTON.

London : Hamilton, Adams & Co., Paternoster Row. Leeds :

Walker & Laycock. 1883.

THE publication of these sermons is an event of no ordinary interest. We have had the privilege frequently of hearing the preacher in days long past; and we know well with what peculiar pleasure those who were once familiar with his voice will hail the appearance of this handsome volume. Indeed, there are discourses in this book which mark an epoch in the mental history of the writer of this notice, who feels that it would be equally ungrateful and impossible for him to merge the disciple in the critic in reviewing it.

A first glance at the contents will show how wide and commanding is the range of topics embraced in the eighteen sermons. They deal throughout with the fundamentals of religion, "the great things of God." They appear to fall into three groups, or cycles—the first, with *Holiness a Method of Living* for its central theme, relating to the individual Christian life, its elementary conception, its beginning, its development and progress, and the conditions on which it depends. The second group, extending from *God's Method of Saving Man*, to *Retrospection the Basis of Progress*, deals with the relations of man to the Truth and to the Person of Christ. And the third, commencing with *The Kingdom of God as the Growth of a Seed*, and closing with *Redeemed Men in Heaven*, sets forth the Divine order and plan of dealing with men under the kingdom of redemptive grace.

There are several features about the book which, we think, call for special attention, and make it well worth the study of those who are alive to the religious difficulties that surround us, and who are concerned that the pulpit should maintain its hold over the conscience and the understanding of thoughtful men of our own day. It is the production of a man who has taken a wide survey of the hostile intellectual world that exists outside our Churches, who realizes the ominous character of the struggle at present being waged between Christ and Antichrist in all the walks of science and of cultured thought. It is not given to every man to serve his generation in this respect. The preacher of these sermons has been able to render his hearers this service in times

[No. CXXI.]—NEW SERIES, VOL. I. NO. I.

L

past, and will continue to render it to his readers, we trust, in a multiplied degree by this record of his teaching.

But we should give a false impression of Mr. Burton's sermons if we suggested that they are ostensibly or principally apologetic in their character. They are in no sense controversial. They are strictly sermons on *Christian Life and Truth*, seeking to exhibit the Christian life in its intrinsic necessity, and in the grandeur of its origin and destiny, and to apply Christian truth in its Divine authority to the conscience and the reason of men as they are in "this present evil world." The best defence of truth, as St. John has shown us in the fourth Gospel, is to let it speak for itself, in face of the error that belies it. And what we value most of all in this volume is, that it presents the Gospel of Christ in the calm and authoritative and yet sympathetic bearing with which it confronts the unbelief of the day, and in the dialect and spirit of one who has himself grappled with that unbelief in its most daring forms.

These discourses speak a language of their own, whose freshness and pungency, joined to the rich and stately eloquence which the writer has at command, lend them a unique attractiveness. Their style is partly, no doubt, the expression of the author's personal genius; but it is to a large extent, as it seems to us, the consequence of the attitude he assumes, and the purpose he has in view. They combine, to a very remarkable and instructive degree, and in a quite untechnical way, the old Evangelical truths in all the loftiness of their supernatural claims and their unqualified assertion of "the goodness and the severity of God," with the modes of conception and expression that belong to modern scientific thought. "There is nothing loose, or timid, or truckling, about the requirements of truth," our preacher says; and the spirit which these words express animates his volume in an eminent degree. The confidence and high courage with which he breasts the tumult and fury of the more violent forms of unbelief are most welcome and reassuring in these days of rebuke and threatening.

We have but one further remark of a general character to make. These sermons show how much vigour and cogency may be given to modern preaching by a discriminating use of the more familiar and accepted scientific ideas, so full as they are of profound spiritual analogies. We have scarcely realized as yet how immensely the scientific conception of natural law has strengthened men's apprehension of the uniformity of all law, how much more positive and definite in many respects our representations of the action of moral and spiritual forces, and of the fixedness of place and certainty of issue belonging to the Divine counsels, may become under the influence of this conviction.

Suffice it to say, that it would be difficult to find anywhere better illustrations of the effective way in which natural phenomena and natural law may be used in the service of Christian doctrine than this

book affords. We would refer on this point especially to the discourses on *Christian Development*, *The Natural Man*, *The Kingdom of God as the Growth of a Seed*, and *the Finality of the Divine Purpose*.

These sermons are noble examples of the preacher's art. They are planned in large, bold outline, and wrought out with the careful elaboration of detail, with the artistic shaping of material, the blending of argument and appeal, of clear-cut crystalline statement, with clustering imagery and copious eloquence, that bespeak the master's hand. And they are preached sermons—not the theoretical product of the study and of seclusion, or mere essays or lectures written to be read. They represent a ministry which, in spite of great disadvantages of voice, and notwithstanding the preacher's retiring habits, and the severe cast of his thought, was popular on a large scale, and in the best sense of the word, while it exercised a singular ascendancy over more cultured and thoughtful hearers. Never can we forget the way in which Mr. Burton's low and measured tones—now animated by some flash of poetic beauty, now calmly enunciating some deep spiritual truth or subtle abstract distinction, now tremulous with tender pathos or glowing with suppressed passion, and charged throughout with an intense spiritual energy—held his congregation spell-bound and forgetful of time, as if listening to some voice from another world which they might never hear again. To have heard him at such times was, to a young preacher, an inspiration for life; it was to gain a rare conception of the power and the dignity of the Christian pulpit, and of the greatness of the preacher's calling. We are expressing a judgment that is not our own merely, but that of others well competent to judge by their skill in the same art, when we place the author of these sermons in the very front rank of modern preachers. Such rare excellence, we may be sure, has been won at no small cost of pains and toil; and such an example ought to be a stimulus and an encouragement to some amongst ourselves to bend their powers more earnestly, for Christ's sake, and for the truth's sake, to the attainment of the highest and most enduring success as preachers of the Gospel.

*The Evidential Value of the Holy Eucharist.* By the Rev.  
G. F. MACLEAR, D.D. Macmillan, 1883.

This little volume has many characteristics which place it high among works of the same class, and a few which rank it among the highest. Its title would hardly lead us to expect what we find in it—a reverent and almost exhaustive delineation of the sacred life in its leading outlines. Without professing to do so, and perhaps without being conscious of doing so, the author has so selected the salient points in our Lord's course as to leave us with the impression that we have been reading a "Life of Jesus," without the objectionable title. The profound interest of this

method lies in the whole being set to one key-note: "The things concerning Me have an end." It would be hard to find anywhere a rival of this work, in the success with which all lines are traced to the Cross—the Sufferer, Divine and human, being shown to have adjusted all His thoughts, words, silences, and acts to that consummation. But Dr. Maclear is faithful to his title, nevertheless. The volume is a contribution to the Evidences from beginning to end. It deals with the common attacks on the history of the Resurrection in a masterly manner, though without adding much to our store of defences. Its apologetic value, however, does not depend upon that. We find it in the keen insight which sees confirmation of the truth of the whole narrative, and, what is much more, the truth of the Supreme picture it draws, in a thousand incidental circumstances which escape ordinary observation. And we find it, where the author would wish us to find it, in the treatment of the main theme: the institution and permanence of the Eucharist as a witness to Christianity. No words of ours could do such justice to the argument as the summary of the author himself in his concluding chapter. From that we take one link out of a strong and well-forged chain:—

"We are called upon to believe that though this rite only commemorated another of the innumerable triumphs of the great conqueror, Death; though it only embodied a disappointment and enshrined despair; yet in spite of the proverbial difficulty of discovering any religion which can transcend the limits of its original home, it has yet secured acceptance amongst the most cultured nations of the West, and has succeeded in banishing into the darkness of oblivion one of the most deeply-rooted forms of worship which was ever obtained in the world. Such a conclusion who can accept? The early celebration of the Holy Eucharist, whether we reflect on the period when it began, or the previous training of those who first accepted it, or the renunciation of popular belief which it implied, or the total and overmastering change of thought and feeling in reference to the most time-honoured convictions which it involved, or its own utterly unprecedented character, remains and for ever must remain an absolutely unintelligible phenomenon without the fact of the Resurrection."

The Eucharist, which closed the sacrificial services of mankind, and is their one sole surviving representative, is in a very original and impressive manner, with much learning and sober judgment, brought into the service of the Evidences of Christianity. One thing we find wanting—and here and there we feel the lack—is a clear view of the relation of the sinlessness of the Sufferer to the sacrifice He offered and bids us commemorate: this would have given additional strength to the argument at some points; and, besides, we should have been glad to have the thoughts of so reverent a thinker on that subject. Moreover, it might have been well to define more at length the precise meaning of "The Single Sacrificial Rite of Christendom;" and, finally, to have made the work the vehicle of some much-needed teaching as to the Eucharist itself.

*The Pulpit Commentary.* Edited by the Rev. Canon H. D. M. SPENCE, M.A., and Rev. J. S. EXELL, M.A.

*Jeremiah.* Vol. I. Exposition by the Rev. T. K. CHEYNE, M.A. Kegan Paul, Trench & Co., 1883.

This series of commentaries goes on its way steadily and faithfully: proving thereby that the Editors' principles still find favour, notwithstanding some severe attacks on the combination of pure and diluted exposition. The mass of homiletic matter is increased rather than diminished; and we are obliged to infer that a larger number of preachers than we had supposed find this kind of catering valuable. Or, is it that the commentary proper is of so good a kind as to win acceptance, notwithstanding the heavy weight it is encumbered with? On the whole, we are disposed to think this the right solution. The expositions are of remarkable value. The best scholars are at work upon them; and the limitation required by the homiletic adjuncts tends to wholesome compression. Dr. Cheyne has done nothing better than his present contribution. His introduction to Jeremiah is a model of that kind of writing; complete and exact, taking cognizance of the latest Continental results; orthodox in the best sense, and without manifesting a reasonable and intelligent sympathy with the honest inquiries of the semi-destructive school. Jeremiah's place among the prophets, his value as a landmark in the history of the development of the prophetic spirit, and his own specific phraseological and literary characteristics, are exhibited in a masterly way. All who know Mr. Cheyne's past history and services as an expositor of the Old Testament take a peculiar interest in him, an interest filled with hope.

*The Epistle to the Hebrews in Greek and English, with Critical and Explanatory Notes.* By F. RENDALL, A.M., formerly Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge, and Assistant-Master of Harrow School. London: Macmillan & Co., 1883.

Mr. Rendall has produced a work which was much needed. His book forms in size and style almost a companion volume to Dr. Vaughan's "Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans." He says in his Preface that "the want of an edition suitable for the student's use has been my chief motive for undertaking the present work; which has been to me a veritable labour of love." The book has no pretension to textual criticism, and bases its text entirely on that of Westcott and Hort, but

the comments on words and constructions will be found of great value. On Heb. iv. 13, he makes the following clear and scholarly note:—

“*τετραχλισμένη*; some Greek commentators labour to explain this word by reference to victims cut open at the throat, so as to expose the inward parts; they adduce, however, no example of this meaning, and it is inconsistent with etymology and usage. *Τράχλος* is used in the New Testament of the back of the neck, on which a yoke was laid (Acts xv. 10), or round which a millstone was hung (Mark ix. 42), or the arms thrown (Acts xx. 37), or which was offered to the descending blow of the sword (Rom. xvi. 4). *Τραχηλισμός* was a technical term for the wrestler's grip on the neck of his adversary (Plutarch), and hence *τραχηλίζω* was used, metaphorically, of having another at your mercy . . . especially by Philo—*e.g. de Cher.* § 24, of one who cowers at the mercy of every foe to grip him by the neck, without courage so much as to look up. Here it describes by an expressive metaphor the guilty malefactor stripped of all disguises, and bowed down with remorse and shame before the eyes of the heart-searching Judge, with whom we have to deal.”

The book, however, has many, and some very striking innovations on the ordinary course of exposition. The most remarkable of these is the adoption of a technical interpretation of our Lord's *τελειῶσαι* as the priestly consecration, with certain subordinate details in the use of it, which seem to us more deferential to Philo than to the general New Testament phraseology. The admirable Appendix on *τελειῶν* must be read to understand the author's meaning and our objection to it: in our judgment he there effectually refutes himself. It is asking too much to require acceptance for the following words: “He was duly consecrated to His holy office by bearing about His own flesh, condemned to death by His own holy will, bruised, worn and bleeding with the cross of patient suffering, and at last nailed to the cross of Calvary.” Again, we cannot receive the notes on ch. x. 14, and xii. 2, which press the same idea to conclusions at variance with the Apostle's view of the relation between *ἀρχή* and *τελείωσις*. “Christ having now entered on His heavenly priesthood, is designated as the consecrator of the faithful (*τῆς πίστεως τελειότης*), as well as captain of the host of the redeemed.” Neither “captain” nor “consecrator” has any right to a place here. Turning to the next chapter we are arrested by another bold defiance of the common interpretation: “Jesus Christ is the same yesterday and to-day as for the times past.” If *ὁ αὐτὸς καὶ* may mean “the same as,” surely *εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας* cannot mean “for the times past.” Many other hazardous renderings occur; but, on the other hand, there are some which greatly improve the ordinary interpretation. And, on the whole, this little volume will be found—even its licenses—extremely stimulating. The grammatical dissertations at the close are such as only a sound scholar could have given us.

The introduction throughout is carefully and well written. But we do not think that it throws any new light on the much debated question of the authorship. He thinks that “the circumstances

of the time supply a probable explanation of the author's detention at Rome; he writes from Italy, where Timothy had been a prisoner with him for some cause which is not mentioned, because already well known to the Church (xiii. 23, 24). They were not, it seems, awaiting trial; and the simplest explanation of their detention is that they were hostages for the fidelity of their Church, carried to Rome perhaps by Vespasian or his generals during the suspension of operations in Judæa caused by events in Italy, and retained here until the course of the war satisfied the Roman government that they might safely be set at liberty." We consider this the weakest point of a good book. The idea of Timothy being a hostage at Rome on account of the Palestinian Hebrew Church, of which the head-quarters were at Jerusalem, seems to us a very unhappy excursion in the way of conjecture.

Speaking generally, the book is good as a help for students of the original, and contains some valuable hints for interpretation. Grammatically and exegetically it is valuable; but as an expository aid to the study of the Epistle it is by no means equal to the Commentary for English readers by Dr. Moulton.

*Aspects of Scepticism, with Special Reference to the Present Time.*

By JOHN FORDYCE, M.A. London: Elliot Stock.

Mr. Fordyce's volume is discursive, without being cursory. Covering pretty nearly the whole field in dispute between religion and unbelief, it does not profess to treat any one topic exhaustively; its purpose is rather to suggest the considerations which must be taken into account under each head. But despite the author's consciousness "that the following chapters are but fragments," the impression on the reader is far from fragmentary. The breadth of reading indicated in the abundant quotations and references is enough alone to prove the author's competence for the task he has undertaken, and the way in which the quotations are introduced shows this still more clearly. They never overlay the writer's own line of thought. We can scarcely give higher praise than to say that in passing from sentences of Fairbairn, Conder, Cairns, Flint, Calderwood, Row, and other similar writers, to Mr. Fordyce's own argument, we are not conscious of descent or incongruity. Moreover, the style and spirit are worthy of the matter. The candour, the power to appreciate opposing arguments, the natural style, the freedom from platitudes, above all, the earnest Christian faith, are such as eminently become the Christian apologist. The author does not write for professed sceptics, but rather for Christians, whose faith needs instruction and confirmation. To the latter class the book is admirably suited. But we think that even avowed sceptics would be impressed by the writer's sincerity and fairness.

There is no attempt to exaggerate either on one side or the other. The writer's case is too good to need such arts. His chief error, as we think, is in the extent to which he over-estimates the harm done by extreme views on his own side. Some strong language on this point is found on p. 50. "Which causes most perplexity," he asks, "the newer criticism, or some older theories of the inspiration of the Bible?" Such questions of comparison are difficult to answer. That harm is done by extreme theories of Christian teachers we have no doubt. But if we were asked, which class of theories is least compatible with the substance of revelation—those of extreme orthodoxy, or those of "the newer criticism"—we should scarcely give the answer which Mr. Fordyce seems inclined to give.

In his first chapter Mr. Fordyce states many facts illustrative of the wide spread of unbelief in our days. The picture is by no means over-drawn. It is almost impossible to exaggerate the danger from this source. The gravity of the case is heightened by the still wider prevalence of scepticism in Continental countries. The peril of our days is undoubtedly on the side of unbelief rather than of superstition; and Rome knows well how to turn this state of things to profit. The Secularist propaganda is especially active among the working-classes of this country, playing skilfully on political grievances and class prejudices. Dr. Flint thinks that its "missionaries in our large centres of population are better qualified for their work than many of those whom our Churches send forth to advocate to the same classes the cause of Christianity." If so, the Church cannot look to the matter too soon. We quite agree with Mr. Fordyce when he says that one reason of the success of Secularism is the want of active sympathy on the part of Christian ministers and Churches with the interests of the masses. There are many splendid exceptions in all Churches. The pity is that they are too often exceptions. The Secularist poses as the friend of the working-man, and the mouthpiece of his grievances, real and unreal. One of his favourite texts is the opposition between Christianity and freedom of every kind! Such falsehoods need exposing by competent men. But while admitting the truth of all that is said in the present volume respecting the extension and peril of unbelief, we believe it would be a great mistake to suppose that the relative is equal to the absolute increase in the forces of scepticism. Every one knows that it would be easy to paint a picture of the growth of Christianity as bright as the other is dark. Tried by every standard, the power of Christian faith, the prevalence of Christian sentiment, the hold of Christian morals, were never so great as to-day. It did not fall within the author's scheme to refer to this side, but it should not be forgotten. Mr. Fordyce happily reminds us that the great names of science on the side of religious faith are not confined to the past. To the Bacons and Newtons of former days must be added such names as Brewster, Faraday, Forbes, Graham, Rowan Hamilton, Herschel, Talbot,

Clerk Maxwell, Balfour Stewart, Tait, Stokes, William Thomson, Andrews and others. Dr. Bain "declares that since the suppression of the Pagan philosophy Christianity has never been more attacked than now, and pretty broadly hints that these modern attacks are not calling forth anything like the ancient Christian vindication." The appearance of vindications is a work of time, but already works have appeared which will leave their mark, despite the contempt of Dr. Bain and his school. The late Professor Green was more than a match for Spencer. Where is Mill's influence to-day? If anything could openly demonstrate "the Failure of Scepticism," to which Mr. Fordyce devotes a concluding chapter, it is the sense of unrest and dissatisfaction with his position evident in Mill's life, and the more than half surrender in his posthumous essays, which so grievously angered his friends.

In his chapter on the Rational Scepticism of J. S. Mill and Miss Martineau our author dwells with repeated and just emphasis on the disingenuousness shown in their refusal even to understand the system they rejected. In the case of both, what they took for Christianity was no more than a caricature. "The God of the younger, as of the elder Mill is the God of a sort of ultra-Calvinism, the Calvinism of the ignorant rather than of theologians. . . . There is no evidence that he ever sought to see Christianity as it is, as we find it in its authoritative records." "We are compelled also to assert that Miss Martineau misunderstood, and even grossly misrepresented, the Christian faith. Like Mr. Mill, she believed the 'essential doctrines' of Christianity to be that God was the 'predestinator of man to sin and perdition, and Christ their rescuer from that doom.'" The first qualification of a judge—knowledge of the facts of the case—was lacking both to one and the other. Mr. Fordyce may well say, "If any unfortunate critic had dealt with Mill's philosophy as he everywhere dealt with Scripture, we can imagine what scathing exposure there would have been by Mill of his rashness and incompetence." Such ignorance can only have sprung from prejudice as inveterate as it was unworthy. A similar prejudice is at the bottom of much of the opposition to Christianity. "Moral antipathy inspires the intellectual opposition."

The chapter on Materialism is one of the best in the volume. The fallacy of supposing that the concomitance of physical and mental action means identity is well exposed. The old fallacy of *post hoc propter hoc*, in another sphere is not more gross. If, as scientists assure us, they "never hope to know anything of the steps by which the passage from the molecular movement to states of consciousness is effected," how can it be asserted that one is a function of the other? The concomitance of physical and mental acts is not more clearly and abundantly proved than their distinctness. By every test that can be applied, they are separated by the distance of a world. The chapters on Evolution and Secularism are equally full of helpful suggestion. The latter is shown to be peculiarly a product of English soil. It professes to be a compromise and to be

compatible with Theism. Practically, of course, it is inseparable from Atheism. As to Evolution, it is argued that Darwin himself wrote from the standpoint of Theism, and his theory is undoubtedly perfectly compatible with religious belief. On p. 190 the author gives a note, which he received from Darwin in reply to an inquiry. In it Darwin says: "It seems to me absurd to doubt that a man may be an ardent theist and an evolutionist." He also refers to his own views as often fluctuating, adding: "In my most extreme fluctuations I have never been an atheist in the sense of denying the existence of a God. I think that generally (and more and more as I grow older), but not always, an agnostic would be the most correct description of my state of mind." This sad note was written in 1879.

*The Character and Life-Work of Dr. Pusey. A Sketch and Study.*

By the Rev. J. H. RIGG, D.D. London: T. Woolmer.  
1883.

The aim of this "volume is to bring out into full light the distinctive characteristics of Dr. Pusey's life-work as a Church leader within the National Church." Its six chapters have the following titles:—"General View of Dr. Pusey's Doctrine and Position as a Church Leader; Dr. Pusey's Earliest Phase of Theological Development as a Liberal Protestant Churchman, 1826-1832; Rapid Transition to Extreme Anglo-Catholic Views; Dr. Pusey as a Preacher; High Church Externalism and Hierarchical Superstition—Dr. Pusey's Teaching as to Baptism and the Lord's Supper; Romish Doctrine and Romish Rules and Services of Devotion—Extreme Intolerance of the Puseyite School."

The fact that one of the editors of this journal is the author of this book prevents us from attempting to criticize it; but the particulars given will explain its character. From the author's preface also it will not be improper for us to quote what follows:—

"The substance of the following pages was originally published in successive numbers of a monthly journal.

"Numerous and pressing requests for the republication of the papers, strengthened by the official request of the Publishing Committee of the Wesleyan Conference, have led me to cast what I had written into a somewhat different form, and publish it, with a small addition, in the present volume. . . .

"The nation is asked to raise a great memorial to Dr. Pusey. Let the people of England clearly understand on what account such a memorial is to be raised. Let them know what have been Dr. Pusey's special merits, what has been his particular work, and the peculiar influence which for forty years he wielded. In learning to know him better they will also learn, in some measure, what is the present condition of a large section of the Church of England. . . .

"His characteristic life-work was to Romanize the Church of England. . . . It is astonishing how little this fact has been realized during the last

twenty years. In proportion as his work became pervasively influential, and although from his retirement he still presided over the whole Neo-Romanist movement, he himself in his relation to the movement was increasingly withdrawn from public observation. He became a sort of mythical personage, his great age and his reputation for sanctity concurring to produce this impression. And when he at length left the precincts of this earthly scene, the world of newspaper readers was prepared to applaud the proposal to rear a memorial to one who had retired from human view to be numbered with the 'mighty dead.' This was natural in generous England. But the generosity of England should be discriminating. The great Romanizer of his age should not be canonized by a nation which still boasts itself Protestant. The writer of this volume is no enemy of the Church of England. He desires nothing more than to see it great and influential, so long as it be not made the medium of diffusing Romanizing superstition. Such superstition has deeply infected the Church of England. At present this is England's greatest calamity, and Dr. Pusey, more than any other man, has contributed to this result."

*Sermons for Boys and Girls*, by eminent American preachers (London : R. D. Dickinson, 1883), is a collection of nearly seventy-five pleasant discourses and lectures for young people. Every kind of subject is treated, and the book is evidently written by men who knew how to make their words lay hold of the ear and heart of the young.

---

## PHILOSOPHY.

*The Relations of Moral and Physical Law.* By Rev. W. ARTHUR, M.A. *The Fernley Lecture for 1883.* London : Wesleyan Conference Office.

It is matter of sincere joy to Mr. Arthur's many friends that he was able to undertake the Fernley Lecture this year. Prevented by long-continued physical weakness from rendering to the Church the public service which he is otherwise so competent to render, he here speaks with the pen to a wider, and perhaps a more influential, audience. The subject chosen is not only timely but well suited to his special gifts. The crystalline clearness of thought and speech, the wealth of apt illustration, the passion for truth, for which he is well known, all come into play here. In some respects the qualities which mark the lecturer's style are French, as in others they are English. The French lucidity, brightness and finish combine with the English strength and vigour. We fancy that the present lecture would readily translate into French.

The timeliness of the subject is obvious. A determined attempt is being made in these days to prove the universal reign of Fatalism, under

the name of Determinism or Law. Positivist, Agnostic, Materialist, Secularist, Spinozist, Scientist—all the different schools of sceptical thought hold one language on this subject. According to them, freedom, responsibility, duty, are fictions, without logical basis. Everything is what it is, and does what it does by a law of inexorable necessity, which excludes the notion of guilt and penalty. Nothing can be more important for the Theist, over against these various schools, than to show that Law and Necessity are by no means convertible terms. Government by general law he accepts. But there are laws and laws. If there are laws whose action is characterized by rigid, invariable uniformity, there are also laws which can be broken, not in a metaphorical, but in the most real sense—broken, but not annulled or abrogated in one case any more than in the other. This is just the difference between the physical and moral order of the world, a difference which materialism is doing its utmost to obliterate, and which the Theist is bound to emphasize as strongly as possible. The Materialist plays upon the ambiguity in the term "law," assumes that it means the same in the moral as in the physical sphere, the same for the relations of sun to plant as for the relations of husband to wife, and then pretends that he has ruled God and religion out of the universe. Mr. Arthur has rendered the highest service to the cause of truth and to the best interests of man in thoroughly arguing out the whole question, and exposing the fallacies involved in the materialistic style of reasoning. By distinguishing the two senses of the term "law," which materialism skilfully confounds, he cuts the ground from under the materialistic argument.

The thread of the lecturer's argument will not be seized and held without careful attention. Really the plan is very simple. Part I. points out the ambiguity lurking in the principal terms. Part II. states the subject to be discussed, and discusses one division of it. The two following parts discuss other divisions, and Parts V. and VI. draw the conclusion. There are discussions of incidental points, which the reader will do well at first to disregard. We must confess also that the flow of the argument is somewhat disturbed by one or two circumstances which we shall advert to afterwards. But, on the whole, the careful student will have no difficulty in following the lecturer, and will be well rewarded for his pains. The subject does not admit of hasty or superficial treatment. Just as a great painting or poem, which is the result of long toil, requires time for its appreciation, so a work like the present lecture, evidently the fruit of much reading and patient thought, demands and deserves the closest study. Above all, it must be estimated as a whole. If the impression left on the reader's mind at the close of each separate part is one of suspense and fragmentariness, the impression, as he looks back from the close, will be one of satisfaction and completeness. The following is something like the course of the argument.

"In the present day few things are more familiar to us than writing

in which it is taken for granted that minds and bodies are governed by laws of one and the same order." Such, as we have seen, is the teaching of materialism of every school. The thesis which the lecturer sets himself to establish is, that minds and bodies are not governed by laws of one and the same order. Both are governed by laws. That is common ground. No Theist questions the reign of law. But law must mean very different things, according to the nature of the objects governed by it. Undoubtedly the word belongs, in its proper sense, exclusively to the mental and moral sphere. Mr. Austin defines it as "A rule laid down for the guidance of an intelligent being by an intelligent being having power over him." This we hold to be a true definition, not of one kind of law, but of law as such. Mr. Arthur justly contends that it is only by accommodation that the term is applied to inanimate, and even irrational, objects. "In the realm of morals we find law in the proper sense, in the sense that is clear to the philosopher, that is inevitable to the jurist, that is 'understood of the people,' that is wrought into all the act and thought of humanity." And in this contention he has with him a philosopher and jurist like Austin, who protests against the use of the term in other senses, objecting even to the phrase "laws of Nature." In the proper sense, law implies intelligence and will on both sides. How, then, has a term, belonging of right to a sphere where intelligence rules, come to be applied to one whence intelligence is absent? Just because, having observed that the order of society is preserved by laws, and then observing farther the order that obtains both in the great and the little in the physical world, we give the name "laws" to the conditions on which the order depends. "This process, natural as it is, results, however, in calling by the self-same name two things that lie very widely apart." The common element in the two cases, it will be noticed, is the order. Now, in the one case we get beyond the mere processes to the power from which the order springs, namely, intelligence. This intelligence is not mere matter of inference; we stand face to face with it, we are conscious of it, if we are conscious of anything. Is it not necessary by every rule of analogy to conclude that in the other case, where intelligence is not directly obvious, the methods by which order is brought about are due to the same cause? Will it be believed, however, that materialism reverses this natural course, affirming that, because physical order exists without an apparent presiding intelligence, there is no such intelligence, and further, that the intelligence of which we are conscious in the other sphere is an illusion? In other words, it takes its definition of law from what is visible in the material world, and then tries to force this idea upon the moral world. Alas for us, if Theism rested on such reasoning!

"The common attribute possessed by both moral law and physical law, which accounts for their being easily confounded, is this: *Each of them determines an order of relations between one agent and other agents.*" Here the same terms are used of both orders of existence, but with widely

different meanings. Parts II., III. and IV., which form the largest part of the lecture, are entirely devoted to expounding the different senses of the words "agent," "relations," "determine," in reference to the physical and moral spheres respectively.

As to the first term, physical agents are everywhere alike without power of choice or resistance; in like circumstances their action never varies. Knowing how one acts, we know how all of the same class will act everywhere and always. Here, therefore, prediction is possible. Moral agents, on the other hand, are free to obey or not; there is no necessity compelling them to act alike; prediction is impossible. Hence in one case there is no question of obligation, responsibility, right and wrong; in the other there is. "It is natural to ask in what sense inflexible instruments without self-guiding discretion, and even without consciousness, can be called agents? They are so called in a sense that is perfectly natural, and very useful, so long as men bear in mind that the term is more rhetorical than scientific, which is what only the few will do . . . Make instruments into agents by poetical license, if you will, but make not agents into mere instruments by any fiction whatever." The latter is done by Materialists. The whole of the discussion on this subject is an admirable exposure of the confusion of thought in materialistic writers.

The term "relation" is used in a like double sense. We speak of relations of magnitude, cohesion, similarity; relations between one world and another, one atom and another; and on the other hand, of relations of authority, obedience, duty. But what differences are here covered by the same word! How little the common element in the two cases beside the distinction between the two! "Why we should call similarity a relation at all is to be accounted for only by the ease with which language transfers acts of mind to bodies, and properties of body to mind." It is quite true that the relations existing in the physical world involve problems of adjustment of the most delicate kind and the vastest range, but those problems are not even perceived by the objects themselves, but only by minds outside them. Physical relations, indeed, are not all of the same kind, they present the widest variety; but they are alike in this; that they are "without variability, without obligation, without possible praise or blame." Reverse this description, and moral relations are defined.

Hence follows a like difference in the use of the word "determine" in the two spheres. "The relations held towards one another by agent and agent under physical law are uniformly identical with those determined by the law; whereas the relations held towards one another by agent and agent under moral law may widely differ from those determined by the law. Hence do we discover two diverging senses of the word 'determine,' the one meaning to render a certain course inevitable, the other meaning to render a certain course obligatory." In one case we have

resistless force, in the other simple authority; in one case, undeviating sequence, in the other, the possibility of resistance. In the physical world necessity reigns supreme; not so in the moral world. As the lecturer points out, physical law represents but one will, moral law represents two wills. Here a counter-will has to be taken into account. The same authority speaks, but the results are different, the differences being determined by the counter-will to which authority makes its appeal. We wish we had space to quote the noble passage (pp. 112-114), in which the lecturer expounds the issues involved in the violation of moral law. We must be content with drawing the reader's attention to it.

Part V. draws out the consequences of the previous *data*, and is a development of the following proposition: "The combined operation of the two orders of law, resulting in a system of free agents and fixed instruments, devolves upon the free agents certain powers of modifying phenomena, even by virtue of the inflexibility of physical law." The nice distinctions intimated here are distinctly expounded in the chapter which follows. Observe the "*free agents*" and "*fixed instruments*," the "*certain powers*" and "*modifying phenomena*." The exceedingly limited area of the uniformity of which we hear so much, the entrance of variability even as early as vegetable life, the extent and limitation of man's power of varying phenomena, are amply illustrated. But we must pass on to notice the last Part, in which the whole discussion is summed up.

The question which the lecturer answers in this section is: "What is fairly presupposed by the existence of the two orders of laws, and their co-ordinated action?" In other words, how are this existence and this co-ordination to be explained? Here he comes into direct collision with Positivism, which forbids us even to ask this question. The Positivist hostility to all inquiry into causes has cropped up once or twice before, but here it is plainly stated, and as plainly met. The reason of this hostility is not hard to divine. The indulgence of the instinct that prompts man to seek an explanation of phenomena, or in other words the search for causes, inevitably leads to belief in soul and God. Hence a system that denies both soul and God can only secure its position by foreclosing the search. And this is what Comte and his followers do. We must not even ask, Why? There is little need to point out that in taking such a course Positivism seeks to eradicate the deepest, most widely-spread, and most potent of human instincts. Brown, Hume, Bain, Mill, simply tried to substitute "antecedent" for "cause." The Positivist is more thorough-going, and lays an interdict on the very question. Canute's enterprise was mere child's-play to Comte's. Nothing can show more strongly the futility of the attempt than the fact that Positivists themselves are obliged, after denouncing all inquiry into causes, to make the inquiry in other terms. Thus, Mr. Lewes, when asked, Whence this spherical form? replies, "I do not know. The question is one which no

positive philosopher will ask, recognizing, as he does, the impossibility of our ever knowing causes." Yet five pages previously Mr. Lewes asks, "What is it which makes the inorganic substance vital?" What is this but asking for the cause? The phrase which the same writer prefers for "cause" is "decisive condition," as though a name made any real difference. Scattered up and down the lecture are many searching exposures of this Positivist prohibition of inquiry after causes. We refer the reader to what is said on pages 10, 13, 17, 196. On p. 183, we read: "We now see why it is necessary to enjoin upon us the duty of not asking why, and not seeking after causes; what demands for self-mutilation of our intellects are modestly made, not in the name of Atheism, but of philosophy. But we cannot help asking why; we cannot help seeking after causes, cannot help, when we see a phenomenon, thinking of something behind it whence it came, and of another something before it at which it aimed." We may inquire into the laws of phenomena, but not into their causes, because the latter are "inaccessible." But, as Mr. Arthur points out, if by "inaccessible" is meant inaccessible to the senses, the same thing is true of gravitation, cohesion, and of force in general, which are only known through their effects, but in which Positivists believe. And "are not laws quite as 'inaccessible' as causes? What law is perceptible through sense?" The truth is that laws are more "inaccessible" than causes. "In ten thousand cases the causes of phenomena have been well known long before the laws governing them were spelled out; and the knowledge of the cause of any phenomenon is the best stepping-stone to the knowledge of its law." In truth, the Positivist's hatred of cause is intensely amusing, and still more so the way in which the poor persecuted victim when driven out of one door returns through another. But let us return from the more general discussion to the immediate question of the last chapter.

Positivism has an answer to Mr. Arthur's question. M. Littré divides all phenomena into three groups—the vital, chemical and physical—and then says: "The vital group presupposes the two preceding ones; the chemical group presupposes the physical group; the last alone presupposes nothing." This at least has the merit of clearness. We have no ambiguity to complain of. But observe the two monstrous assertions. First, that the higher is developed out of the lower, and, secondly, that while the third depends on the second, and the second depends on the first, the first depends on nothing! "The last alone presupposes nothing." It is the Brahminical theory of the tortoise over again. If the first group requires no basis, why do the second and third? If the second and third require a basis, why does not the first? "According to Comte, physics includes sun, moon, planets, earth, with light, heat, fluids, acoustics, and electricity. Thus it comprises, in fact, all creation except organized beings, though it leaves out of view chemical properties, which none the less attach to every body included in the group." Let us also remember

the endlessly-diversified adaptations implied in the physical group. "Physical laws clearly presuppose the power of fitting unconscious agents to co-operate, first, with other unconscious ones, and, secondly, with conscious agents, and the power of adjusting such fitness to distances small or great, from the infinitesimal to the practically infinite." And M. Littré "had brought his mind to accept a creed which taught that while you could not account for life without presupposing chemistry, and could not account for chemistry without presupposing the mechanical existence of bodies, you must say that light, heat, day, night, tides, eclipses, air, sound, snow, hail, comets, sun, moon, stars, do not require anything to account either for their separate existence or their combined action." An intelligent Christian would be sorry to plead guilty to such credulity. The lecturer very cleverly applies the Positivist logic to M. Littré's great dictionary. We perceive here three groups of phenomena—the literary, industrial, and commercial. The third presupposes the second, the second presupposes the first, and the first presupposes nothing, not even M. Littré! As to the first of what we have called the two monstrous assertions of Positivism, we wish we had space to quote all Mr. Arthur's forcible criticism. We give a sentence or two. "According to Positivism, 'Consciences receive law from tissues, tissues from molecules, molecules from mechanical masses, and mechanical masses from nothing. Down from conscience to tissue, from tissue to molecule, from molecule to mass, from mass to nothing, is the line of progress. Here we join issue; we assert that this order of dependence for law is contrary to all that men know, all that experience teaches, and all that reason can infer from things within knowledge and experience.' A sentence of Comte is quoted, which says: 'To minds early familiarized with true philosophical astronomy the heavens declare no other glory than that of Hipparchus, of Kepler, of Newton, and of all those who have aided in establishing their laws.' On this the lecturer remarks: 'Mark the language, 'aided in establishing their laws,' as if we said that Blackstone established the laws of England, or Harvey the circulation of the blood.' To discover is to establish! It required genius to discover, but none to establish! 'We assert that, when the intellect is asked to believe in the establishment of such an order of arrangements without any foregoing thought, it is asked to do in this case what would not be asked of it in any ordinary case, except by one who meant to disregard the ordinary rules of reason.' The existence of the two orders of laws, whose nature is so fully expounded in the lecture, and still more their co-ordination, point conclusively to an infinite intelligence that designed and created them. 'Each order of laws in itself represents infinite powers of mind, deliberate will and pregnant acts. The two in co-ordinated operation carry all this up into the sphere of beneficent moral purpose. And you can ask me to believe that all this arrangement does not presuppose any arranging mind or determining will! Now, I am free to say that to me such a

demand appears to be not reason, but unreason; and unreason pushed so far as to be accounted for in men of sane mind not without difficulty. We cannot banish our intellect to that Arctic world of the agnostics, where middles come without beginnings, beginnings without causes, and order without an ordainer; where mind begins by putting on the snow spectacles which prevent it from looking behind a fact for the explanation of a fact, and ends by bestowing on abstract humanity the attributes of Providence. If a man is resolved that his reason shall in no case compel his heart to unsay what he has said in it (namely, that there is no God), he may well begin by telling his intellect that it is not in a condition to be left at large, but must be put under restraint, and may well lace it up so tightly that it shall never ask why? to what end? or who did it?"

Such is a very bald outline of the lecturer's course of reasoning. We have passed by many valuable incidental discussions, and should recommend the reader to do the same, in the first instance, if he would seize the main line of thought. Nor have we by any means selected the most telling points or the most eloquent passages. These assert themselves without any aid of critic. It will be seen that the lecturer's attack throughout is directed chiefly against the Positivist position. He has acted wisely in taking this course. The Positivist theory embodies the essence of the materialism of the day in its most concentrated, uncompromising, and tangible form. It has no reserves or compromises. Its Atheism is logical and avowed. In exposing its true character, therefore, you are exposing the other theories which are the same in substance, while different in name, or which halt at some midway position. The spirit that denies can go no further than it has gone in Comte. Religion is not the only interest involved. Every existing social institution and philosophy are as deeply involved. Plato, Aristotle, Descartes, Leibnitz, Kant, are all blunderers to Comte. The destruction of Christianity is only preliminary to the destruction of a great deal beside. It is therefore safe to predict that the triumph of Comtism is a long way off. We commend to the reader's attention some remarks on Comte's philosophic arrogance on page 46.

Among the incidental points, one of the most interesting is the powerful argument from analogy for an order of being above man. Man is the culmination of an ascending series of existences. From mineral, through vegetable and animal, the chain is unbroken; link joins on to link; at each step new powers emerge into light. In the animal world especially, the types and presages of something higher are numerous. Rudiments at least of the family, the state, of property and morality, are seen. "In the social relations of animals is shadowed forth a penumbra of moral law." Still more suggestive is the dependence of animal on man. Now there are precisely similar hints and presages in the nature and life of man. There is also a like sense of dependence. Man is not the author of the world, but a part of it. The question is pertinent; "Does the institution

of headship extend no farther than this little earth? Has the universe beyond it no common head? Does the ascending order of intelligent being set its loftiest crown on the brow of man?" (See also pages 64-66.) We know it may be replied, that strict analogy only points to an endless ascending series. But, without entering on this question, analogy is against the series coming to a dead stop in man. By a happy parable, Mr. Arthur shows how an "Agnostic Oak" might adduce the Agnostic and Positivist argument against the notion of the existence of such a being as man. The conclusion to which the "Agnostic Oak" comes, reminds us strongly of the jargon by which certain writers impose on common mortals. The conclusion to which a course of reasoning exactly resembling that of Positivists leads the Oak is that, without any interference of man, "Growth accounts for circulation of juices, for reticulation of veins, for respiratory action, for absorption and exhalation, for efflorescence, for semination, for synthetic synergy of organ and environment, for co-ordinate efficiency of organ and function, for epigenetic progress from germ to organ, and for carpogenethlic synkinesis of the sexes, with other phenomena of the botanic hierarchy." It is also shown in different places how precisely similar arguments against higher orders of existences would apply at other points.

We would direct especial attention to the way in which the lecturer, while maintaining the co-ordination of the two orders of law, vindicates the rights of each, of the physical as well as the moral. Materialists often pose as the champions of the physical, as if any one could disregard it. The relations of matter and mind are admirably stated in the lecture. While mind controls matter, its control is not unlimited. Matter affects mind, but cannot be said to control it, or even to act on it. Physical laws cannot be broken by either physical or moral agents. Moral laws can be broken by moral, but not by physical agents. It is well said that "the habit of speaking of violations of physical law is always misleading. It is often a mere device to confound physics and morals. What are called violations of physical laws, such as sailing in a crazy ship, or eating unwholesome food, or breathing foul air, are really violations of no physical law, but only of the moral law: "Do thyself no harm." In every case the sway of physical law is unbroken. "The plain phrase, 'running contrary to nature,' has in it more both of science and philosophy than pretentious speeches about violation of the laws of nature. We may run contrary to nature, and in so doing we violate moral law, and incur moral guilt; but it is the guilt of defying almighty force, and not the guilt of frustrating beneficent physical law. Will can dash against physical law, but it fares like a blinded bird dashing against granite." The phrase, "modifying laws of nature," is shown to be just as incorrect. We modify phenomena by our use of the laws of nature, and even this power is strictly limited. "Some one has said that prayer for fine weather, in certain cases, is something like praying that water may

run uphill; both would involve a violation of the laws of nature. Water left alone does not by law of nature run uphill; but the learned professor who so spake has a heart that beats, and every time it does so water is sent running uphill to the top of his head. Water will not only run uphill, but up side-walls if mind adjusts the laws of nature to make it do so; and mind can do that easily." "The co-ordinated action of the two orders of law is so manifested in nature that no natural law is more natural, no unchangeable law more unchangeable than is this one, that physical laws absolutely inviolable shall be set in motion by intelligent agents, and controlled in their operation by such agents within determined bounds."

Another fact ever to be borne in mind is that the only adequate cause is intelligence. Mechanical causes are only instruments. The mind in its search for an explanation is not satisfied until it has got back to an ordering mind. It is easily understood why this is so. In his own life man always finds mind to be the ultimate cause, and his inference is that the same holds good of the operations of nature. By the parable of the paddle-wheel this truth is excellently illustrated in the lecture (p. 122-130). The illustration may perhaps seem at first to be worked out at tedious length. But the purpose is to insist that the originating force in the whole series of movements is in mind. And it is worth while to note how much is involved in the most familiar operations.

We have already hinted that the impression left on the reader at first may be that the progress of the argument is at least slow. Unless the reviewer is mistaken, this is chiefly due to the abundance of illustration. The lecturer's great power of imagination is turned to excellent account, but it may be a question whether it is not sometimes used too freely. We have in view especially sentences in which exactly similar cases are accumulated in great number. After the first two or three the reader feels that nothing is gained by further addition. We may mention that on p. 6 there are six illustrations of the same ideas. We would also suggest whether the exceedingly clear and subtle analysis of the different classes of relations, pp. 66-84, does not in its present position tend to check the flow of the argument. The author indeed suggests that the section "may be skipped, if the reader wishes." As a supplement, however, it would seem less of an interruption. Honesty required these criticisms; but they are only slight qualifications of the excellence of a lecture, which will be more appreciated the more it is studied. Our quotations may seem to have been numerous. We should like to have quoted much more. Our meagre notice gives little idea of the richness of thought and language with which the most important points are worked out. The conception and elaboration of the argument are as noble as the subject is seasonable. The respected author is to be congratulated on being permitted to make such a contribution to Christian apologetics.

*An Examination of the Structural Principles of Mr. Herbert Spencer's Philosophy: intended as a Proof that Theism is the only Theory of the Universe that can satisfy Reason.*  
By the Rev. W. D. GROUND. Parker & Co., Oxford; and  
6, Southampton Street, Strand. London, 1883.

This is a work which it is difficult to praise or blame without much qualification. The author is evidently an enthusiastic admirer, and on that account we think a not altogether discriminating critic, of Mr. Spencer. At any rate he is prepared to concede to him a great deal more than we are. Thus he seems to assume that Mr. Spencer's system is really a unification of knowledge, an harmonious and comprehensive whole, marred only by the agnostic metaphysics which are associated with it. Considerable and detailed study of Mr. Spencer's writings has led us to the conclusion that the unification is really illusory, mainly verbal, in fact, and that the doctrine of evolution, so far from being of universal application, is strictly limited to the phenomena of organic life. We think that the processes which Mr. Spencer terms respectively the evolution of inorganic, and the evolution of super-organic aggregates have little in common with the evolution of organic aggregates except the name. In this connection, perhaps, we may be allowed to refer our readers to an article entitled "The Synthetic Philosophy of Mr. Herbert Spencer," which appeared in our last issue. In our opinion it is unwise to accept from Mr. Spencer or any other evolutionist more than the actually established *data* of the theory; for as soon as an attempt is made to formulate the theory in general terms the region of metaphysical controversy is reached, and a rash admission or two may involve very unwelcome conclusions.

So long as the evolutionist confines himself to the correlation and co-ordination of observed facts, he may fairly claim to speak with the authority which is due to those who are the acknowledged masters of a special craft; but when he undertakes to theorise upon the nature of the processes which he observes and describes, he enters upon a region in which every person of disciplined intelligence is as likely to be at home as himself. We may admit that the observations made by Darwin and others were made with true scientific exactitude, and recorded with the utmost precision, and that the inductions which they drew from them are worthy of the most respectful attention; but when the question comes to be one of defining evolution in general, the final decision seems to us to rest with the logician and the metaphysician, rather than with the man of science. Evolution cannot be raised to the dignity of a universal formula without a plentiful crop of metaphysical problems being at once raised—such, *e.g.*, as the nature of space and time, of the external world, of force, of mind, and of matter, and of the relation

between mind and matter. For the solution of these problems, a life spent in scientific research, or in mastering the results of scientific research, is the very worst of all possible trainings. It is very rarely indeed if ever the case, that your man of science is capable of saying an intelligible word upon a question of metaphysics. The true metaphysical instinct is very rare, and to make a metaphysician there is needed not merely instinct, but training, and that of a severe and athletic character, a training which can only be got by persistent and systematic study of the works of the great metaphysical thinkers of past ages, a training which we need hardly say Mr. Spencer does not claim to possess, and which indeed he would probably disclaim with something like scorn. Such being the case, it seems to us that a critic should be on his guard lest he adopt any of Mr. Spencer's philosophical opinions without the most careful examination; and we are sorry that Mr. Ground has, as we conceive, been hurried by his generous enthusiasm for a thinker whom he considers to have met with scant justice from most of his critics, into conceding to Mr. Spencer some positions which appear to us to be far from tenable. Thus, that most extraordinary work, "*First Principles*," abounding, as it does, with reasoning from analogy of the loosest and flimsiest description, and not free, as we think, from positive blunders in science, is summarised by Mr. Ground in a few pages, and apparently accepted without reservation as scientific truth. And not only does he give Mr. Spencer credit for having in "*First Principles*," "reduced to a logical unity the sensations of an ascidian, and the creations of a Shakespere," protesting that "after nine years' careful study," he "can find no gap on which to rely;" but he suggests "that another volume by the same man might easily disclose so many and such varied points of union as to make up one plain, logical arch from mechanics, through chemistry, up to organic life." When Mr. Ground wrote this passage he was certainly not in a critical frame of mind; and if we might make a suggestion, we should strongly advise that it should not be reprinted. After an exhibition of faith in Mr. Spencer's achievements and capabilities so robust as this, we are not surprised that Mr. Ground should have found no difficulty in accepting the loose analogy between society and the human body, upon which Mr. Spencer's sociological system is based, as exact and indubitable science. Doubtless an interesting parallel may be drawn between the machinery by which society maintains and regulates itself and the various organs and members of the human body. The observation is at least as old as Plato. There is, however, this essential distinction between the social system and the human body, that, while the one is mere machinery, the other is a living organism. The much quoted aphorism of Mackintosh, to the effect that "constitutions are not made, but grow," is after all less a truth than an untruth. Constitutions are made, but only by a gradual process. They cannot be improvised, but they are still made, wrought out piecemeal by the unremitting labour of suc-

cessive generations, adjusted and readjusted, improved or impaired, by the deliberate application of human effort from age to age. The same is no less true of all complex machinery whatsoever. No delicately adjusted machine ever assumed its final form at the hands of its first inventor. But is it on that account scientific to place machinery in the same category with organic life? Did the piano grow out of the harpsichord, or the organ out of the paupipes, in the same sense as the man develops from the child? and is the intricate machinery of our British constitution any the less machinery because it took many centuries to perfect? In our opinion the loose way in which the idea of evolution is applied by Mr. Spencer is quite unworthy of the age. We observe with still more regret that Mr. Ground gives a kind of tacit adhesion to Mr. Spencer's highly questionable theories of the origin of religious worship, and of the belief in the immortality of the soul. Thus he holds that the idea of an existence prolonged after death evolved itself out of the primitive savage's meditations upon the phenomena of sleep and dreams. The savage is supposed first to evolve the idea of a double self, a waking self, and a sleeping self; and then, identifying or confusing sleep and death, to reach the notion of a future existence. Now it is obvious that this is a perfectly unverifiable hypothesis; but not only so, it is a perfectly absurd one. It pleases poets to speak of "the sleep of death," of "death and his brother sleep;" but the awful distinction between death and sleep is too glaringly patent to allow of the inference required being drawn by the rudest intelligence. Homer's familiar lines,

καὶ τῷ νῆδυμος ὕπνος ἐπὶ βλεφάρουσιν ἐπιπτεν  
νήγρετος ἡδιστος θανάτῳ ἄγχιστα ἐοικώς

suggest (what we believe to have been the universal feeling of the archaic world upon the subject), not that death is a kind of sleep, but that in sleep the bonds which link soul and body are loosened. Hence the respect paid to dreams and visions. If we pre-suppose the belief in a spiritual world, we can readily understand how dreams would inevitably be interpreted as messages from that world; but to suppose that the idea of such a world grew out of the attempt to account for the phenomena of sleep, and suspended animation generally, seems to us a preposterous assumption.

Still less inclined are we to accept the view that religious observances have developed out of ancestor worship. In our opinion theism is the first instinct, as it is the last conviction, of reflective humanity. That which we term reflection is nothing but the deepening of that self-consciousness which, properly speaking, is personality itself; and, as self-consciousness deepens, so does the dim instinct which ascribes to mind a controlling power over matter give place to the rational conviction that matter itself is nought, and that mind is the reality of things. But the

instinct, we hold, was coeval with self-consciousness, and being so, it would find spontaneous expression in whatever form of ritual might best accord with such measure of intellectual advancement as the race might from age to age achieve. The propitiation of the *manes* of departed ancestors undoubtedly plays a conspicuous part in the religious observances of archaic humanity; but we think it is comparatively late in origin, and that the vague primitive theistic belief had already differentiated itself into the polytheism which personifies every force of nature before the conception of the demigod arose, or could in the nature of things arise. The demigod, in fact, represents that stage of human development in which the power of man to control and utilise the forces of nature begins to be recognised, and that is of necessity a comparatively advanced stage.

We have dwelt thus upon what we deem Mr. Ground's defaults as a critic of Mr. Spencer, because we thought it our duty; and, in turning from them to the consideration of some of the questions upon which he dissents from Mr. Spencer's philosophy, find ourselves in a position to accept and endorse a great deal of his criticism. These, as might be anticipated, relate chiefly to his psychological and metaphysical theories. Thus, upon the question of the nature of the subject, Mr. Ground shows, by a careful comparison of passages (what had already been shown in the pages of the *Contemporary Review* in greater detail and with a much more trenchant manipulation of the dissecting knife, by the late Prof. Green, of Oxford, in whose premature death last year English philosophy sustained a loss at present irreparable, but to whom, curiously enough, Mr. Ground does not once refer), that Mr. Spencer's theory is self-contradictory, that while he sometimes, after the familiar fashion of empirical philosophers, identifies the self with "the aggregate of feelings and ideas actual and nascent," at other times he in terms disclaims this view, describing the self as "the unknown permanent *nexus*, which is never itself a state of consciousness." And then, with a spark of genuine philosophical insight, Mr. Ground observes: "It is not the aggregate of the states of the *ego* which makes the *ego*, but their fusion into one whole; the *nexus* which makes out of all mental states one mental and moral empire—a moral personality—which makes the *ego*. In many parts of his Philosophy Mr. Spencer has stated this; and if he does not hold and teach it everywhere his Philosophy will fall in ruins. With personality solidly established, he will find that the will is more than the various states of mind; it is the power which enforces law over the whole realm—the executive of the *ego* commissioned to hold every mental state in strict control." In our opinion, this is true and profound thinking. We hold that the whole character and quality of our metaphysical and ethical thought, and so far as conduct is determined by speculative principles (and for most of those who really think it is in some measure determined) the complexion of our lives, depend upon the view we take of the nature of consciousness, upon whether we regard

the self as a mere stream of sensation flowing we know not whence or whither, or as an immortal spirit living, indeed, in and through the successive moments of sensitive existence, yet transcending any and all of them, and furnishing to itself a motive in the ideal of the most perfect realisation or fulfilment of itself, a fulfilment not otherwise possible than by the stern renunciation of its purely self-regarding impulses, capable of overruling the lawless suggestions of sensual appetite or private interest. As regards the nature of the ultimate reality, whether it is intelligence or blind force, Mr. Ground's argument reduces itself to a very simple one, none the less cogent, however, by reason of its simplicity. It is admitted, or, rather, asserted by Mr. Spencer that human intelligence is a manifestation of "the ultimate reality," by whatever name it may best be designated. But how, urges his critic, can that which is unintelligent manifest itself in intelligence? Can force manifest itself as other than itself? We need hardly say that there is no answer to this. Mr. Spencer, throughout his system, simply bawls out that it does so. He gives no sign at any point that he has ever perceived any difficulty in the matter. Yet the emergence of consciousness out of unconsciousness is only the psychological counterpart of the biological theory of spontaneous generation upon which he is so severe. If, then, Mr. Ground argues, the *Synthetic Philosophy* is not to fall into ruins, intelligence must be attributed to the ultimate reality, and Mr. Spencer's agnosticism must be abandoned. And if intelligence be attributed, the moral qualities follow as a matter of course. Evolution unquestionably does "make for righteousness," and to suppose that God, in visiting sin with punishment and associating happiness with righteousness, acts without regard to the quality of the conduct, to which He attaches such consequences, is not only to derogate from His majesty—that is a consideration which perhaps does not affect the scientific mind very powerfully—but, to commit a fault of logic. Why should God be the only intelligent being who is not presumed to intend the consequences of his acts?

We have not attempted in the space at our disposal to do more than to indicate to our readers a few of the more prominent characteristics of this book. We do not by any means agree with the high estimate which the author places upon Mr. Spencer's philosophy, or the disparaging remarks which he makes concerning such thinkers as Dr. Martineau and Mr. St. George Mivart; nor do we think that the agnostic's armour is so closely knit, that at present there is no prominent divine throughout Christendom who has yet shown himself to possess that calibre, grasp, extent and accuracy of information which are needed to fashion a bolt that would pierce it. Agnosticism, in our deliberate judgment, is the creed of men who have not received the peculiar intellectual discipline which is indispensable to the philosopher. The agnostic of the day is simply a half-trained thinker, who with perfect *aplomb* enunciates to a generation that has sat at the feet of Kant, the crude metaphysics of the pre-Berkeleyan

era, and the difficulty of dealing with him consists chiefly in the fact that he needs to be instructed in the rudimentary principles of metaphysical science in order that the discussion may proceed at all; and as he makes it a point of honour to cherish a sturdy prejudice against metaphysics, the prospects of success in imparting the necessary instruction are not, as a rule, brilliant. Nevertheless, reason must eventually assert her rights.

τάληθές δὲ πλείστον ἰσχύει λόγον.

*A Study of Origins; or, the Problems of Knowledge, of Being, and of Duty.* By E. DE PRESSENSÉ, D.D. Translated by ANNIE HARWOOD HOLMDEN. London: Hodder and Stoughton. 1883.

The historian is not always a philosopher, and more seldom a man of science; but Dr. Pressensé has shown himself to be all these in the works which have proceeded from his pen, and he has not gone beyond his depth even in taking up the questions involved in the problems of Knowledge, Being, and Duty. These topics, which are as vital to Christian doctrine as to Psychology, Ontology, and Morals, have been left vastly too much in recent years to mere unbelieving naturalists. Hence we have supercilious Positivism, the veiled Materialism of the Associationists, and the Agnosticism, and even Atheism of the Evolutionists, dominating the realms of Metaphysics and Ethics. This book, viewing the various questions embraced in Psychology and Ethics from the intuitional point of view, will be welcomed by all those who, like Dr. Pressensé, wished to see dispelled "the fatal misconception that science and conscience, liberty and religion, are incompatible."

The first section of the work is devoted to an inquiry into the nature and validity of the intellectual instrument as subsidiary to the consideration of other problems. The cognitive faculty must be rightly understood at the very outset in all speculations of a mental and moral character, and that is the method which all the masters in these regions of thought have pursued. If the Materialists and Positivists have started out with a study of the nervous system, it is because to them psychology is only a branch of physiology, and cognition is nothing but cerebration. Dr. Pressensé presents a fine vindication of the *à priori* in knowledge. He follows the critical method in the first instance, and then becomes eclectic, adopting the Kantian philosophy as interpreted and modified by Cousin and Ernest Naville. Positivism, the psychology of J. S. Mill, and of Herbert Spencer, in England, of Taine, in France, and of Lotze, Fechner, and Wundt, in Germany, are subjected to a careful analysis and a close and sifting criticism.

Religion, to Comte, was mere Fetishism; Metaphysics was pretty

much the same, with personified abstractions for the fetishes; while Science, as spoken of by the Positivist, has nothing of science in it, inasmuch as that which constitutes the very essence of true science, the study of causes, is not tolerated by him. Religion, philosophy, and science have always co-existed, and frequently have been united in the same individual. Littré has repudiated the mystic vagaries of his great master, and smiles at Comte's apotheosis of woman, yet, in denying the possibility of the existence of a First Cause, he goes beyond facts; and becomes metaphysical, which is contrary to the first principle of Positivism. Comtism originated in confusion of thought, and never could have existed but for the mental and moral aberrations of its founder, whose career so strongly discredits his philosophical pretensions.

Perhaps the most interesting part of this section of the book to English readers is that which deals with the Spencerian psychology. J. S. Mill and the Associationists may be regarded as the precursors of those who explain Mind upon Evolutionist principles, for heredity is a form of association, and represents the total of all past acquisitions inscribed upon the nervous system of the individual. This theory, because it responds to the habit of generalization, which seems almost instinctive in the human mind, has obtained a remarkable hold upon our age; but Dr. Pressensé has fairly grappled with its plausibilities and its vast pretensions, and it is difficult to see how a theory so radically unsound and so untenable in all its essential principles, can possibly survive, when the glamour of its novelty has faded, and it stands naked before the world.

The consciousness of the Ego is fatal to both Mill and Spencer. Sensations or nervous impressions are mere empty and shadowy phenomena till the Ego comes in, and succession or simultaneousness among them are not even relations in any true reality until some connecting link is found which shall constitute a principle of synthesis.

The influence of the Cartesian philosophy is well explained. By its error concerning extension it led the way towards the Pantheism of Spinoza, which Leibnitz failed to counteract; for his Optimism was a species of Determinism, and was quite inconsistent with the supposed Individualism of the monad. Descartes, however, won immortal fame in establishing the authority of consciousness, and it was this which gave us Kant and his formal laws of thought. The subjectivity of the pure reason is the foundation of the Kantian philosophy, which might, however, De Pressensé thinks, have degenerated into wild idealism, had not Maine de Biran shown that the intuitions of space, time, &c., are not mere laws of thought, but have an experimental or objective basis in the Ego. This basis is the *effort* which belongs to the initial act of knowledge. Hence the will is concerned in cognition, and the wall of partition between the pure reason and the practical reason is broken down. Ernest Naville has made more of the *à priori* in knowledge than Maine de Biran did, and

this is the psychological position of Dr. Pressensé, which he expounds fully in an interesting and carefully written chapter.

The next two books deal with the problem of Being, the second being occupied with the origin of the Cosmos, and the third treating of Man. Here, of course, the Darwinian theories have to be reckoned with. Darwin's assumptions undoubtedly go beyond the bounds imposed by a strict logical and scientific method. To reason from the known to the unknown is permissible and necessary, it is true, but from indistinct ideas and mere hypothesis no just inference can be drawn, and no induction framed. The variations in individuals of which Darwin makes so much are indefinite and accidental, and are not always produced, even when apparently the same causes are at work. In the struggle for existence the weak also survive, there being room for both strong and weak, and if in some cases the unfit are vanquished, that may mean no more than that there is a merciful provision to prevent the perpetuation of weakness or of suffering. Neither Biology nor Palæontology sustains, in its all-including breadth, Darwin's doctrine as to the transmission of variations, nor have the utmost efforts of skill and art by artificial selection and cross-fertilization produced anything approaching to a new type.

It is only in its later development by Spencer and Haeckel that we obtain a complete view of the attitude of Evolutionism towards the problem of Being. If the starting-point of the Spencerian Cosmology is unsound and illogical, its goal is dreary and disheartening. If the last stage of Evolution were ever reached, there would ensue a period of reaction and disintegration, and all the noble products of the long travail of Nature would revert to their original chaotic state.

Haeckel, with a daring that has no parallel in philosophy or science, has carried Materialistic Evolution to its logical issue, but his whole system is falsified by the fact that he has upreared it on the assumption of spontaneous generation which science rejects. The only apology Haeckel presents for his strange and really inconceivable doctrines is that "there is no other resource but to believe in a supernatural miracle."

English readers will be thankful for Dr. Pressensé's clear explanation and excellent criticism of the philosophy of the Unconscious, which has aroused so much enthusiasm among the virtuosi of German metaphysics, but which has been too imperfectly understood in this country. This system is as contradictory as it is pessimistic. It professes a teleology without an intelligent First Cause; it sees no more in human reason than mere spontaneity or instinct, a part of the great *Unbewusste* which with Nature it makes up, and it knows no remedy for the problem of evil but the self-destruction of the being who has awakened to consciousness out of the unconscious.

In the anthropological section of his book, Dr. Pressensé deals very ably with the materialistic attempt to identify thought with cerebration,

and shows that although man, physiologically considered, is dependent to some extent upon chemico-physical laws, yet, in regard to his conscious life, his exercise of volition, his conscience with its categorical imperative, and his powers of speech, so far transcending the mere signs or gesticulations by means of which brutes express their sensations, he is essentially distinct from the animal creation.

Not the least valuable section of this part of the book is the analysis and examination of modern sociological speculations. A concise account of the various theories which have sprung up since Comte entered upon this field is a want that has been greatly felt. Rousseau's "*Contrat Social*" has long been regarded as an illusion, and the mechanical or determinist explanations of sociological problems which Buckle, Spencer, and others have given us are unreal and inadequate. In the "*Social Organism*," as well as in psychology, Dr. Pressensé contends that the will is a factor which must not be ignored.

The fourth and last book treats upon Duty. The freedom of the will, a liberty which is mysterious, but which is sufficiently unfettered to make a man the father of his own actions, is the basis of Moral Obligation. This age needs a strong and masterly criticism of Necessarianism which is insinuating itself into much of the ethical discussion of the day, and which, under the guise of Heredity or Solidarity, is slowly sapping the foundations of personal responsibility. We need not follow Dr. Pressensé through his examination of Epicureanism, of the utilitarian systems of Bentham and Mill, and of Spencer's ethical doctrines; these are now well-worn paths, although we have gone over them with Dr. Pressensé without weariness.

An important point connected with Ethics is the relation between religion and morality. The determinist, of course, will smile at the idea of religion being concerned in the science of conduct, and yet even he would be obliged to admit that the religions of the world have exercised a profound influence on the morals of mankind, and that a belief in God has ever been one of the most potent motives to duty. This subject is ably handled by Dr. Pressensé, and the whole question of the development of religion, especially the theories of Max Müller, is thoroughly considered.

A very interesting chapter is added on Primeval Man, wherein recent antiquarian and geological researches are made, to show that such writers as Sir J. Lubbock and Mr. Tylor are quite wrong in regarding early man as a mere savage.

We regard this book as one of the healthiest and most satisfactory treatises on the subjects with which it deals that have appeared for some years. If we felt disposed to refer to any slight defect where almost all is excellent, we should object to several vague expressions towards the end of the book, such as the "high antiquity of man," and the "myth of Eden," which are quite unnecessary to the argument. On this point we

need do no more than mention Professor Dawson's judicious treatment of these topics, showing from the relics of ancient man that a period of from 8,000 to 10,000 years is quite sufficient to meet all legitimate requirements of the problem. We can scarcely repress astonishment that amongst the multitude of books of varying quality and value to which Dr. Pressensé is indebted, he has made no mention of any of the works of so able a writer as Professor Dawson.

*The Influence of Mind on Mind.* By JOHN BATE, Author of "Cyclopædia of Moral and Religious Truths," etc.  
London: T. Woolmer. 1883.

Amongst the testimonials accompanying this volume is a letter from Mr. John Bright, who says: "I have read some portion of it, and intend to read it all. There is much in it that interests me." If one of the most practical statesmen of the age thinks these 700 pages worth reading, it can hardly be doubted that their contents are more than usually good; and we think that those who begin to read the book will not willingly lay it aside till they have completed its perusal. Though Mr. Bate adheres to the old-fashioned truths of the Gospel with conscientious fidelity, he has given us another proof, if any such were needed, that they can never lose either their practical value or their attractiveness. The scope of the work is very extensive. The influence of mind on mind is one of the most comprehensive themes which a writer could select, and Mr. Bate has displayed no small courage in undertaking such a task amidst the activities of ministerial life, and in conducting it to a successful issue. The numerous topics handled by him are of surpassing interest. Whilst the unity of the work has been well preserved, each chapter may be read as a separate essay. The treatment is fuller in some cases than in others; but that we might naturally expect, as volumes have been written on some of the subjects, and nothing more than a bird's-eye view of them was possible in a work like this.

Mr. Bate is an omnivorous reader, and possesses in a high degree the faculty of retaining and utilising the stores of knowledge which he accumulates. An appendix contains a list of nearly 500 authors quoted or referred to. Some authors may penetrate more deeply into the philosophy of mental phenomena, and others may soar into higher regions of poetry and eloquence—though the eloquence that is born of deep conviction, clear views, and earnest purpose, is not wanting here; but few will open out a wider field for observation and reflection.

## HISTORY AND BIOGRAPHY.

*John Wesley, sa Vie et son Œuvre.* Par MATTHIEU LELIÈVRE.  
Nouvelle Edition, complètement Refondue. Paris :  
Librairie Evangélique, 4, Rue Roquépine. 1883.

IT affords us the greatest satisfaction to see this new edition of Pastor Mathew Lelièvre's *Life of John Wesley*. The work has been completely recast, and enlarged to the extent of forty per cent. of additional matter. This is beyond comparison the best life of Wesley in anything like a compendious form which we possess. It stands, of course, altogether apart from the elaborate three volumes of annals and history given us by the vast, and at the same time minute, labours of Mr. Tyerman.

The first edition of 2,500 copies was published in 1868. The book immediately took rank as a classic in France, while its value was very soon recognized in other countries. It was introduced to the readers of the *Revue des Deux Mondes* by no less eminent a *littérateur* than Charles de Rémusat, and has been translated into five languages, English, German, Italian, Tamil, and, very recently, Bulgarian, the English edition having been from the able hand of the Rev. Alfred J. French, who will also, we hope, do England the great service of translating the present edition.

Since the original edition was written, several very valuable works on Wesley have been published, including, in particular, Mr. Tyerman's volumes. Of these works, and of others of older date which have been brought to M. Lelièvre's knowledge, full use has been made in the present edition. The value of the new work is proportionately enhanced. The first edition was exhausted within a short time after its publication. The intervening years have been devoted by the author to the improvement and completion of his work. We can say nothing more than that the result is worthy of the twelve years and more bestowed upon the work. "Our first work," says M. Lelièvre in his Preface, "was essentially a popular life of Wesley. Without depriving the volume of that character, we have aimed this time at satisfying also the needs of the man of letters, and offering to scholars a more complete and finished work."

The effect of the former work on continental Christianity has been great. The review by Charles de Rémusat produced a deep impression over a very wide area of continental thought, German as well as French. A distinguished French writer, who has written especially on the moral and religious history of England in the eighteenth century, M. Edouard Sayous, utters, in regard to Wesley, a striking exclamation: "The great servants of God," he says, "are not the property or the secret of England. God can raise them up where He will. He can give to French society a

French Wesley. Oh! that he may come, and, whatever may be the name of his Church, may he be blessed."

We confess that we know of no instrumentality or influence so likely to bring about in whatever measure this result, as the wide circulation of this noble volume of M. Lelièvre's, and the increasing spread of the knowledge and ideas which, mainly by his labours, have now found a lodgment in the French mind—the mind of cultivated and serious French thought. Being the work of a Frenchman, writing primarily for French readers, this volume does not perfectly meet the wants of Englishmen and especially English Methodists as respects the life and work of Wesley. A compendious and adequate *Life of Wesley* for English Methodism and for England is still wanting. But until that want is supplied, the general public of English Methodism and of England could not be furnished with a better substitute than this *Life of Wesley* by a French Methodist pastor, who appeared at the late Hull Conference as the representative of the French Methodist Conference. Nor could young English Methodists better employ and cultivate their knowledge of the French language than by reading in this most interesting and instructive volume the elegant French of M. Lelièvre.

*Dissertations on Early Law and Custom, chiefly selected from Lectures delivered at Oxford.* By Sir H. S. MAINE, K.S.S.I., LL.D., F.R.S., Author of "Ancient Law," &c. London: Murray.

Clearness, firm grasp of what he deals with, and at the same time wide range of thought, are always the marks of Sir Henry Sumner Maine's writing. We were amused, in a recent newspaper controversy, to find a celebrated "crammer," attributing to him, "from internal evidence," an attack on the cramming system. We can fancy that what is popularly understood by the word could hope for very little sympathy from one whose books so thoroughly defy the hasty reader. He will find no advantage whatever in superficially turning over Sir H. S. Maine's pages on the chance of picking out a few facts which may be useful in an examination by-and-by. You must study as you read; and, in reading, you will miss much unless you already know something of the literature of the subject.

Nevertheless, there are a few "ruling ideas" which re-appear in all the volumes, and of which the author is evidently fond, because it is mainly through him that they have come into prominence. One of Sir H. S. Maine's great authorities is John Austin. His view of "dominion" colours all that his follower has to say on the subject, whether he is dealing with early institutions, or discussing the more technical subject of legal classification. Another point on which he is very strong is that

the patriarchal family is the real starting-point of society, and in proof of this he even quotes Mr. Darwin, who believes the jealousy that is so marked in all the higher animals would have been an insuperable bar to that promiscuous intercourse which, dignified with such names as communal family, writers like Sir J. Lubbock assume to have been the earliest form of human intercourse. This is a point of such immense ethical importance that we intend at a future time to dwell on it more in detail. We lately examined at some length the evidence for the antiquity of man, and showed cause for a verdict of "non-proven," not only against those who tell us that he existed in pre-glacial times, but against those who push back into far-off geological epochs the time when he certainly did come into the world. We found that there was nothing in the testimony of the rocks to upset the Biblical chronology, when once the Septuagint rendering, and not the narrow interpretation of Archbishop Ussher, is accepted as correct. But hand in hand with the effort to find traces of man in pre-glacial strata goes the assumption that primeval man was a savage scarcely above the level of the anthropoid apes, and that therefore he must have taken infinite ages to develop such civilizations as unquestionably existed in Egypt and Babylonia at a very early date. And, being a savage, the inference is that he began like the lowest existing savages, in a state of promiscuous intercourse, out of which the germs of the patriarchal family were slowly evolved. "No," says Sir H. S. Maine, not in this his latest work only, "man began as the member of a true family; this promiscuity which we are told is found in certain savages nowadays is a later state; it is worse than the first, the state when he had, in Darwin's words, retrograded in his instincts. Beginning as the member of a family in which kindred was reckoned exclusively through males—i.e., in which the same ideas of relationship prevailed as those which exist among ourselves, man would not need long ages to form a highly civilized community." That is the way in which Sir H. S. Maine's investigations into Early Law and the Theories of primitive society bear on that "Antiquity of Civilization," to which, before long, we purpose reverting. But the volume before us is by no means limited to issues of this kind. It is, perhaps, the most generally interesting of the interesting series of which it is the latest. Whether Sir H. S. Maine is treating of the sacred laws of the Hindus; pointing out the analogy between Mann's so-called institutes and Leviticus; reminding us of the throb of intellectual curiosity which went through Europe when Sir W. Jones, with his company of native literates, set to work at Sanskrit, showing that in the Punjab, the earliest seat of the immigrant Aryans, there are scarcely any traces of religion in the laws, and that "the sacred books show not the beginning of law but of lawyers;" or whether he is treating of ancestor-worship—the worship of the *Lar familiaris*—of the actual dead father by several African tribes, and pleasantly jesting at the Chinese custom, whereby a good place in an examination brings

honours and titles to the examinee's father and grandfather, he is always full both of fact and of suggestion presented in the most readable form. One charm of his books is the way in which he finds unexpected analogues in lands separated by half the breadth of the earth. The "literary fosterage," for instance, so well known to all students of the Irish *Brehon*, exists in almost the same form in Hindu law, where also the pupil's heirship to his teacher is distinctly recognized. The traces of kinship through females in the old Irish law are referred to the persistent tradition about the earliest inhabitants having come from a long way over sea, probably therefore with very few women—a state of things which Sir H. Maine thinks sufficient to account for Mr. M'Lennan's communal family, wherever it really exists.

For the light which our author incidentally throws on Roman history, every scholar must be grateful. The change in the Roman law, for instance, when the narrow, crabbed enactments of the Twelve Tables came to be "distilled through the jurisdiction of the prætor," has never been more clearly set forth; nor the analogy between this "Prætor's Edict" and the so-called equity of our Chancery Court, which brings in the King as a supplementary judicial authority.

How it came about, that in cities the popular assembly grew, the kingly power becoming more and more shadowy, while in the country exactly the reverse took place, is as important to the political student as the growth of representative institutions; while the same chapter, "The King and Early Civil Justice," in which this contrast is discussed, gives the general reader an amusing account of the extraordinary marching power of that John whom we usually rank among the most effeminate of our kings. In England, and even in roadless Ireland, he travelled as fast and as incessantly as any commercial traveller nowadays.

The chapter on "France and England," sets in quite a new light the causes why feudalism led to such different results in the two countries; and the author's careful study of Taine and Chassin and Doniol, enables him to sustain the startling thesis that the Revolution took place because a great part of the soil of France was held on copyhold tenure; it was not their ownership of land, it was the vexatious rights they possessed over the lands of others which made the nobles hated, which prompted the wholesale burning of châteaux with the view of destroying the muniment rooms and their contents.

But we must close, though our notice is all too inadequate. One word about the chapter on East European House Communities. We have often been referred to the North Slavonian *mir*, and the Indian village community and joint family for the beginnings of Aryan political life; but in the South Slavonian House-family, Sir H. Maine thinks these beginnings may be traced with less of foreign admixture; for in South Slavonia "the crust of Mahomedan institutions has preserved the old customs as completely as buried cities are preserved by ashes or lava."

Here reverence for old age is still in as full force as it was in the days which Ovid regrets when he says: *Magna fuit quondam capitis reverentia cani*. Here the house is ruled by "the eldest ascendant." Here the process by which the chief grows out of the head of the family is going on before our eyes. It is well that Professor Bogisic has such an able interpreter in what our author calls this case of social and political embryology. And now we part company with a writer whose caution is as marked as his suggestiveness, and who has thrown as much light on early European law as he has on that Indian law which was at first his special subject. Every one who wishes to understand India must of course read his books; and we may say the same to every one who would thoroughly understand the growth of our own institutions. One of the most valuable passages in this last volume is the appendix on the Andaman islanders. These people used to be confidently described as little better than the brutes, living in promiscuity, without even the most rudimentary ideas of God, altogether answering to the notion of "the missing link." Further research, now that the islands having become a penal settlement for India have been carefully scrutinized, leads to wholly contrary conclusions. The Andamanese have ideas of God superior to those of several other savages. Far from living in promiscuity, they are most careful of the relations between the sexes. The women are peculiarly chaste. The *patria potestas* is firmly vested in the chief as head of the joint family; and the chiefess is also the recognized head of the women whose husbands are under her husband. Altogether these islanders show most clearly a social state which has often been assumed to belong exclusively to members of the Aryan races.

*Scotland in Pagan Times.—The Iron Age.* By JOSEPH ANDERSON, LL.D., Keeper of the National Museum of the Antiquaries of Scotland. Edinburgh: David Douglas. 1883.

The Council of the Society of Antiquaries of Scotland have done wisely to elect Dr. Anderson for a second term of two years as the Rhind lecturer on Antiquities. In 1879 and 1880 he delivered two courses of lectures on *Scotland in Early Christian Times*, which have won the highest praise for their careful research and clear teaching. In the present volume we have his lectures on the first part of the Pagan period—*The Age of Iron*; the close of his course will be devoted to the study of the *Age of Bronze and the Age of Stone*. "There is a true archaeological distinction between the Pagan and the Christian periods, in the fact that Paganism had two distinctly typical customs—(1) the burning of the bodies of the dead; and (2) the deposit with the dead (whether burnt or unburnt) of grave-goods—urns, weapons, clothing, personal ornaments and implements, and utensils of domestic life." The introduction of Christianity changed these customs, but of course

they struggled for awhile to keep their hold, and continued to be observed in some regions in a modified form. Thus we find that not only was Childeric, the last of the Pagan kings of France, buried seated on a throne in his kingly robes, arms, insignia, &c., but "Charlemagne, the establisher of Christianity (who meted out the punishment of death to the Saxons who dared to burn their dead after the old manner), was also buried seated on a throne, with his royal robes, his arms and ornaments, and the book of the Gospels on his knee." These facts will show the caution which antiquarian students need to observe, and this volume is a fine instance of the right temper of mind for such work. The contents of the graves found in the Isle of Islay in 1878 prove them to be of Norwegian type, and of the heathen period of the Viking time. The articles found are here examined in detail, and illustrations and comparisons are drawn from Viking graves in Norway, which seem to establish conclusively the closest relations between the two. Norwegian paganism intruded into the north and west of Scotland, and introduced types and phenomena which are purely Scandinavian. Sometimes the Celtic and Scandinavian types joined to form a series of modified types, partaking to some extent of the distinctive characteristics of both. The hoards of coins and ornaments, as well as various graves found in the northern and western coasts of Scotland, show how important was the colonization made there by the heathen Northmen. Indeed, the interest of the historical annals connected with these Viking times far surpasses that of the earlier colonization by the Romans. The art remains show both great technical skill and high quality of work. "There is implied in their production a special dexterity in preparing moulds and compounding alloys, in casting, chasing, and engraving, in the polishing and setting of jewels, in the composition and fixing of enamels." Art was by no means the exclusive possession of classic antiquity. Three of the six lectures are devoted to the "brocks," the lake dwellings, hill-forts and earth-houses found in the north of Scotland. The "brocks" are the remains of a unique style of architecture. They are houses built of stones carefully fitted together without cement of any kind, in the form of round towers with walls ten to seventeen feet thick, and rooms and galleries built in the walls with windows opening into the centre of the hollow tower. Better defences against the roving bands of marauding Norsemen could scarcely be devised. They are indeed a kind of "burglar-proof safes" for the people and their cattle, &c.

It is not possible to give too high praise of the work which these lectures represent. The volume is profusely illustrated; clear and careful in all its statements. It gives new life to "Scotland's iron age—the Pagan period of her Celtic people;" and we shall look forward to the next volume, which is to deal with the Age of Bronze and the Age of Stone, with much interest. Dr. Anderson unites high research to great caution and logical acuteness, and we heartily thank him for these valuable lectures.

*The History of Mary Stewart, from the Murder of Riccio until her Flight into England.* By CLAUDE NAU, her Secretary, now first printed from the original MSS., with illustrative papers from the secret Archives of the Vatican and other collections in Rome. Edited, with Historical Preface, by the Rev. JOSEPH STEVENSON, S.J. Edinburgh: W. Paterson.

This is a very interesting contribution to the never-to-be-settled controversy as to the guilt or innocence of Mary Queen of Scots. It was soon found that Mr. Froude had by no means said the last word in this controversy. Mr. Hill Burton had his say, in the work noticed many years ago in this REVIEW, and gave reasons for discrediting those casket-letters on which Mr. Froude mainly grounded his case. Father Stevenson, of course, is thoroughly convinced of Mary's innocence. The tragedy of the Kirk of Field, he believes, on Nau's evidence, to have been wrought by the lords, for the express purpose of getting the Queen into their power; and, when they found this less easy than they expected, they used all possible means to induce her to marry Bothwell, "that so they might charge her with being in the plot against her late husband and a consenting party to his death, appealing to the fact that she had married the murderer." Nau's narrative, if we assume it to be authentic, is simply Mary's own statement, dictated to her secretary, and seized, along with other papers, when she was inveigled into leaving Chartley on pretence of a hunting party, and then hurried back after meeting Elizabeth's commissioners, her papers having been meanwhile ransacked, and Nau sent prisoner to London. We think Father Stevenson has fairly established its authenticity. Nau's handwriting is known, and its identity with the MS. narrative (Cotton, Cal. B. iv. 94) has been proved by experts; but, of course, this brings us no nearer the facts. The Queen naturally makes out the best case for herself; but whether it is a true case or not, who shall say? When, for instance, we read that, as she was leaving Darnley, after her last visit to the house of murder, she came upon Paris, Bothwell's valet, and, noticing that his face was blackened with gunpowder, exclaimed in the hearing of many of the lords: "Jesu! Paris, how begrimed you are!" we feel the want of that corroborative testimony which can never now be hoped for in this world. Lethington, Morton, Murray, were not likely to repeat, even if they heard, words which went far to prove that the plot was theirs, and not the Queen's. But why was Darnley in that lone house and not at Holyrood? The reader often forgets that he was suffering not only from the foul disease which Mr. Froude hints at but also from smallpox, and that at Holyrood he would be sure to have brought infection to the young prince. The Queen wished to take him

to Craigmiller, but he chose the Kirk of Field on the recommendation of Balfour, one of the lords: "He did not wish any one to see him in his present condition, nor until he had gone through a course of baths in private." It is also forgotten that, amid the unkind coarseness of her husband, Mary was not without grave suspicions that the lords were attempting to poison her. Once, during a visit to Jedburgh, she was so long unconscious, her body being cold and distorted, that all thought she was dead, and Moray began laying hands on the plate and jewels. But though it is surely well that the reader should study Nau before deciding on the whole question of guilt or innocence, his narrative (as we said) cannot, from the nature of it, settle anything as to the matter of the Kirk of Field. The appendices, from the secret archives of the Vatican, the Barberini Library, and the private archives of the Society of Jesus, include a report on the state of Scotland written in 1594, and sent to Pope Clement by the Scottish Jesuit priests—no more trustworthy, of course, than would be a report on the present state of England by those English Romanist priests who have so often since the Tractarian movement shown themselves wholly misinformed on the subject. One point in this report is noteworthy—"The chief argument (say the writers) to induce the mob to adopt heresy was to assure them that henceforth no tithes were to be paid." These appendices also include the very interesting documents, letters, &c., connected with the mission of William Chisholm, Bishop of Dumblane, to the Pope, A.D. 1566. Father Stevenson gives them in the original and also in translation. The book well deserves study; nobody can pretend to have mastered the case without reading the new matter brought forward in it.

*A Methodist Pioneer: the Life and Labours of John Smith, including Brief Notices of the Origin and Early History of Methodism in different parts of the North of Ireland.* By the Rev. C. H. CROOKSHANK, M.A. Wesleyan Conference Office.

*Memorable Women of Irish Methodism in the Last Century.* By the Rev. C. H. CROOKSHANK, M.A. Wesleyan Conference Office.

Mr. Crookshank's books deserve a wide circle of readers. They tell their tale clearly, and show the author's keen appreciation of the heroic work done by these first labourers in Irish Methodism. John Smith was a native of Clare in the co. Armagh, and before his conversion was the ringleader of a gang of desperadoes, given to intemperance, gambling, blasphemy, boxing, cock-fighting, and the like, the pests of the town and

neighbourhood. Many warrants were issued for his arrest, but his desperate character, his great physical strength, and his influence among his comrades, who rallied round him when he was in danger, kept him out of the hands of the authorities. How this desperate man was rescued from sin and made a "burning and shining light," Mr. Crookshank's volume will show. In 1766 Mr. Wesley appointed him a Methodist evangelist, and till his death in 1774 he was constantly at work as circuit minister and connexional evangelist in Ireland. His life was often in great peril. Once a man who had determined to kill "that conjurer," as he called the zealous preacher, came out from his hiding-place behind the hedge and confessed his sin. Smith prayed with him, and the poor man became a humble Christian. In 1774, as he was on his way to his circuit quarterly meeting, a man "waylaid him, struck him on the back of the head with a pitchfork, knocked him down, and so maltreated him as to leave him apparently dead." A few days afterwards the faithful soldier went home, mourned and honoured by all who knew him.

Mr. Crookshank's other volume tells the story of the notable women of Irish Methodism. It shows what widespread influence the great evangelical revival exerted on all classes of society. Barbara Heck, who carried such blessing to New York, was one of these noble women. The other sketches throw much light on the religious life of those days. Anne Devlin, in utter despair about her soul, goes to the Roman Catholic priest. He urges her to seek "jovial company, and to be sure to dance a great deal;" adding, "a shilling to the priest and a few days in purgatory will do away with all." One scarcely feels surprise to hear that when she found peace, under the preaching of one of Mr. Wesley's assistants, and resolved to renounce Popery, the same priest sent her word that he would "tear her out of the Church and make hawk's meat of her."

Methodism had friends and adherents in high circles in Ireland, and awoke many members of other Churches to new zeal for Christianity. Mrs. Mary Smyth's journey from Dublin to London to see what was expected to be Garrick's last appearance on the stage, and her conversion through Romaine's preaching, is a remarkable story. Both volumes have many points of interest, and show well the different paths which lead human hearts to peace.

*Sheridan.* By Mrs. OLIPHANT. (*English Men of Letters.*)

Edited by JOHN MORLEY. London: Macmillan & Co.

Richard Brinsley Burke Sheridan is the most brilliant and the most strikingly typical of all that Anglo-Irish race which has (or had) stamped its idiosyncrasies on history as the distinctively Irish character, but which, as Mrs. Oliphant acutely remarks, is now yielding place, in the public view and in political consideration, to the older, more deeply indented, more passionate and implacable, and also more religious people

—those of the original, or, at least, earlier Irish race—who constitute the main staple of the population of Ireland. As to this point, we cannot refrain from quoting the observations of Mrs. Oliphant at length:—

“The Sheridans were of that Anglo-Irish type which has given so much instruction and amusement to the world, and which has indeed in its wit and eccentricity so associated itself with the fame of its adopted country, that we might almost say it is from this peculiar variety of the race that we have all taken our idea of the national character. It will be a strange thing to discover, after so many years’ identification of the idiosyncrasy as Irish, that in reality it is a hybrid, and not native to the soil. The race of brilliant, witty, improvident, and reckless Irishmen whom we have all been taught to admire, excuse, love, and condemn—the Goldsmiths, the Sheridans, and many more that will occur to the reader—all belong to this mingled blood. Many are more Irish, according to our present understanding of the word, than their compatriots of a purer race; but perhaps it is something of English energy which has brought them to the front, to the surface, with an indomitable life which misfortune and the most reckless defiance of all the laws of living never seem able to quench. Among these names, and not among the O’Connors and O’Briens, do we find all that is most characteristic, to modern ideas, in Irish manners and modes of thought. Nothing more distinct from the Anglo-Saxon type could be; and yet it is separated from England in most cases only by an occasional mixture of Celtic blood—often by the simple fact of establishment for a few generations on another soil. How it is that the bog and the mountain, the softer climate, the salt breath of the Atlantic, should have wrought this change, is a mystery of ethnology which we are quite incompetent to solve; or whether it is mere external contact with an influence which the native gives forth without being himself strongly affected by it, we cannot tell. But the fact remains that the most characteristic Irishmen—those through whom we recognize the race—are, as a matter of fact, so far as race is concerned, not Irishmen at all. The same fact tells in America, where a new type of character seems to have been engrafted upon the old by the changed conditions of so vast a continent and circumstances so peculiar. Even this, however, is not so remarkable in an altogether new society, as the absorption, by what was in reality an alien and a conquering race, of all that is most remarkable in the national character which they dominated and subdued—unless, indeed, we take refuge in the supposition, which does not seem untenable, that this character, which we have been so hasty in identifying with it, is not really Irish at all; and that we have not yet fathomed the natural spirit, overlaid by such a *couche* of superficial foreign brilliancy, of that more mystic race, full of tragic elements, of visionary faith and purity, of wild revenge and subtle cunning, which is in reality native to the old island of the saints. Certainly the race of Columba seems to have little in common with the race of Sheridan.”

For the history of Sheridan, the materials are scanty. His habits were so irregular; he was always either so engrossed and overwhelmed with business, or so absorbed in the vortex of fashionable life, whether the life of pleasure or of politics, or of both, that he had no time for correspondence—indeed he very commonly left his letters unopened—and no leisure for reflection, nor any habit or faculty of self-control, such as might have

enabled him to cultivate friendship. His acquaintances were innumerable; of friends he had scarcely one—not one, so far as we can find. He sacrificed more of his time, and gave more of what might have been accounted as friendship's labour and tribute, to a profligate prince, than to any or all besides. That prince, when he came to power as Regent, threw his so long serviceable retainer and brilliant boon companion overboard at a stroke, and never looked after him again, or lifted a finger or spoke a word to save him from degradation and ruin, from sordid poverty, overwhelming debt, and death, in the midst of misery and disgrace. To such a result was the most brilliant of Anglo-Irishmen brought. He had genius, sensibility, generosity, great capacity both for business and for action; he achieved the most wonderful triumphs in the most public and conspicuous positions; he was one of the most admired and popular men of his day, and the most brilliant and overwhelming orator known in the House of Commons in his wonderful age; and yet to this result he was brought by a combination of indolence and recklessness, which can only be described as infatuated, and by habits of intemperance which, even for that age, were excessive. Such a man was not likely to leave orderly records of his life, nor were there either friends surviving him to recount the details of his history, or letters to or from his contemporaries to furnish the materials for a memoir. A few years after his death, Thomas Moore received from the family all the letters and papers which could throw any light on the subject; but the memoir he wrote was not, and could not be, satisfactory. Other material has been published since; but the whole taken together leaves not a few periods in the life of this extraordinary man quite obscure, and, as might be expected, his melancholy last days almost wholly dark.

Never was a history so monitory—so crowded with painful lessons—as that of Sheridan. Mrs. Oliphant has done her work with excellent taste and feeling, as well as with great ability. We are inclined to think, however, that, gentle and merciful as is her handling of the darkest features of his character and case, she has hardly done full justice to the wonderful capacity of this most gifted man—this wanton waster of the finest powers and the grandest opportunities. Sheridan, however gifted, could never, we think, have become what he did become, or accomplished all that he accomplished, if he had merely taken flying shots at the chances which his quick eye discerned as they flashed into sight amid the rushing whirl of events and circumstances. Mrs. Oliphant makes it to be a piece of his high-flying recklessness that he forbid his young and charming wife, from the time of their marriage, to sing in public, even at concerts or at oratorios. To us it seems that his instinct was fine and right in so doing. He meant to hold a position—for her as well as himself, and for their family—superior to that of the world of *artistes*, equal to that of the best of the land; and he succeeded. He had confidence in his genius as adequate to justify his boldness and to warrant his ambition. Nor was

his confidence vain. His genius, his independence, his many gifts and graces, combined with the charms of his wife, accomplished all and more than all that he had dared to aspire to. It was not a question whether the Duchess of Westminster should stamp fashion on himself and his wife. The Duchess was fain to accept his invitations to his own house, and once for all his position was established in society. It was not his ambition or his independence that wrecked him. He succeeded in becoming the proprietor of Drury Lane Theatre, though his whole means had been his wife's small fortune. His writings were not only the most witty and brilliant compositions for the stage which had been known in the century; they were, though not free from the taint of fashionable vice, the most harmless of their kind. The best of them retain to the present time their hold upon the public favour. But his aspirations went far beyond the character of a playwright. At twenty-nine he became a politician, and entered Parliament as member for Stafford. What was the brilliancy of his career there is known to all. His capacities and his conceptions were great and striking, and his powers were such as to bring him, in every sphere he entered, success which nothing but his reckless love of pleasure and excitement, the fascinations of society, drink and play indulged in to a wild excess, and with all this the utter want of business habits and of any power of habitual self-control, could have so disastrously broken down and changed into ruin so complete. No doubt the destruction by fire of Covent Garden Theatre, of which he was one of the proprietors, accelerated his ruin, and his loss of his seat in Parliament, which he had held consecutively for more than thirty years, completed it, not only by removing him from his public position on the great political stage, but more especially by leaving him, unshielded by the prerogative of a member of Parliament, at the mercy of his creditors. He was born in 1751, he entered Parliament in 1780, and died in 1816.

We have referred to the destruction of Drury Lane Theatre by fire as a proximate cause of his final ruin. The account which Mrs. Oliphant gives of this is in several ways illustrative of the character of Sheridan. Sheridan was in the House when the fire broke out and with a sudden blaze illuminated the Parliamentary chamber.

"When some scared member, perhaps with a tender thought for the orator who had once in that place stood so high, proposed the adjournment of the House, Sheridan, with the proud calm of which such a highly strained nature is capable of in great emergencies, was the first to oppose the impulse. 'Whatever might be the extent of the calamity,' he said, 'he hoped it would not interfere with the public business of the country.' He left his brother members to debate the war in Spain, while he went forth to witness a catastrophe which made the further conduct of any struggle in his own person an impossibility. Some time later he was found seated in one of the coffee-houses in Covent Garden, 'swallowing port by the tumblerful,' as one witness says! One of the actors, who had been

looking on at the scene of destruction, made an indignant and astonished outcry at him, when Sheridan, looking up with the wild gaiety of despair and that melancholy humour which so often lights up a brave man's ruin, replied: 'Surely a man may be allowed to take a glass of wine by his own fireside.' The blaze which shone upon these melancholy potations consumed everything he had to look to in the world. He was still full of power to enjoy, a man not old in years, and of the temperament which never grows old: but he must have seen everything that made life possible flying from him in those thick coiling wreaths of smoke. There was still his parliamentary life and his Prince's favour to fall back upon, but probably in that dark hour his better judgment showed him that everything was lost.'

Drury Lane Theatre, it should be added, was rebuilt by subscription, and Sheridan received, first and last, £24,000, as an equivalent for his proprietary rights, his son receiving £12,000. Such an amount, however, as £24,000 was an insignificant fraction of what Sheridan needed only to pay his debts, and it seems almost all to have gone to his creditors, leaving him still in hopeless embarrassment. He was in no position to secure his re-election for Stafford at the coming dissolution of Parliament. He was deserted by all his great friends. His physician, Samuel Rogers, the poet, and his countryman, Thomas Moore, were almost all that stood by him at the last. We quote from Mrs. Oliphant the pitiful description of his case at the last:—

"When the troubles of his later life culminated in illness, a more forlorn being did not exist. He had worn out his excellent constitution with hard living and continual excesses. Oceans of potent port had exhausted his digestive organs; he had no longer either the elasticity of youth to endure, or its hopeful prospects to bear him up. He was, indeed, still cheerful, sanguine, full of plans and new ideas for 'getting through,' till the very end. But this had long been a matter beyond hope. His last days were harassed by all the miseries of poverty—nay, by what is worse, the miseries of indebtedness. That he should starve was impossible: but he had worse to bear, he had to encounter the importunities of creditors whom he could not pay, some at least of whom were perhaps as much to be pitied as himself. He was not safe night nor day from the assaults of the exasperated or despairing. 'Writs and executions came in rapid succession, and bailiffs at length gained possession of his house.' That house was denuded of everything that would sell in it, and the chamber in which he lay dying was threatened, and in one instance at least invaded, by sheriffs' officers, who would have carried him off wrapped in his blankets had not Dr. Bain interfered, and warned them that his life was at stake. One evening Rogers, on returning home late at night, found a despairing appeal on his table. 'I find things settled so that £150 will remove all difficulty; I am absolutely undone and broken-hearted. I shall negotiate for the plays successfully in the course of a week, when all shall be returned. They are going to put the carpets out of the window and break into Mrs. S.'s room and take me. For God's sake let me see you.' Moore was with Rogers and vouches for this piteous demand on his own authority. The two poets turned out after midnight to Sheridan's house, and spoke over the area rails to a servant, who assured them that all was safe for the night. Miserable crisis so often repeated! In the

morning the money was sent by the hands of Moore, who gives this last description of the unfortunate and forsaken—

"I found Mr. Sheridan good-natured and cordial, and though he was then within a few weeks of his death, his voice had not lost its fulness or strength, nor was that lustre for which his eyes were so remarkable diminished. He showed too his usual sanguineness of disposition in speaking of the price he expected for his dramatic works, and of the certainty he felt of being able to manage all his affairs if his complaint would but suffer him to leave his bed."

Death came to this gifted, but reckless, and, as to eternity, almost utterly thoughtless being, as a terrible surprise. When the Bishop of London came to see the dying man, "such a paleness of awe came over his face" as his wife "could never forget." We do not venture to look farther into that awful darkness. In such misery and gloom he died, almost wholly neglected. He was buried in Westminster Abbey, with a splendid public funeral—dukes and princes volunteered to bear the pall. Two princes of the blood and half the peerage followed his remains to the Abbey.

Sheridan was, perhaps, the most improvident and reckless man of whom we have any knowledge. "There was a bag on his table, into which all letters were stuffed indiscriminately, and in which, when it was turned out, an astonished applicant for debt or favour might see a succession of his own letters as he sent them, with not one seal broken; but, to lessen the mortification, would find also letters enclosing money sent in answer to Sheridan's own urgent applications, turned out in the same condition, having been stuffed with the rest into that hopeless waste heap." When Professor Smyth appealed to Sheridan's old servant to know if nothing could be done to remedy this, Edwards told him a piteous story, how he had found Mr. Sheridan's window, which rattled, wedged up with bank-notes, which the muddled reveller, returning late at night, had stuffed into the gaping sash, out of his pocket."

His plays he never finished till some time after the rehearsals had begun. He had not written a line of the last scene of the *Critic*, when the company assembled to go through what was to be the last rehearsal but one. And, to get the scene written, his partners took the method of locking him up in a room with anchovy toasts and a supply of claret, as well as of writing material, assuring him that he would not be let out of the room till the work was done. He took the matter in good part, and wrote the scene at once. Nevertheless, on special occasions, he showed great power of application, and made very large preparation for his public work, as, for example, in the case of his wonderful speech on the impeachment of Warren Hastings.

Sheridan was twice married. Of his first wife we have spoken, his second was the daughter of a Dean of Winchester, many years younger than himself, and brought him five thousand pounds. She survived him. Sheridan's descendants have held their place among the loveliest women of English society and the most gifted men of our aristocracy.

## BELLES LETTRES.

*Sonnets.* By the EARL OF ROSSLYN. London: Blackwood.  
1883.

**L**ORD ROSSLYN is an amiable, cultivated, and high-bred nobleman. As such, he was sent by Lord Beaconsfield's Government to represent Her Majesty on occasion of the marriage of King Alfonso, of Spain, to his charming young bride, Queen Mercedes, who, it will be remembered, died within ten months after her marriage, at the age of eighteen. This book of sonnets the author had intended to inscribe to Lord Beaconsfield, who had often expressed a wish that he should do so. They are now, therefore, dedicated to his memory.

It is a pity, as it happens, that the volume is thus connected with the name and memory of Lord Beaconsfield, the noble author having felt it necessary to open his series of sonnets by two of which the subject is the great Tory leader. Both the sonnets are dated the same day, the day of Lord Beaconsfield's death; one, however, having been written, or being supposed to have been written, before he actually passed away, the other immediately after his decease. Neither sonnet possesses much merit. The first, being also the first in the volume, is very weak and faulty. A poet's writing should always be at least correct. Confusion of thought and phrase is a fatal flaw in any poetry, but especially in the sonnet. What then must be said as to the following lines:—

“A man—whose thoughtful brow  
Uniting wide extremes of high and low,  
And bravely meeting all the ups and downs  
Of wayward fate—just both to crowds and crowns  
Grows old with grace, as only wise men grow”?

The volume contains memorial sonnets relating to a wide variety of distinguished persons,—on the Queen Mercedes and her death, and on King Alfonso; on Admiral Rous, the “Nestor of the turf;” on the Princess Alice; on Lady Smith, who died in her 104th year, two; on Lord Lytton and Lord Ravensworth; on other persons of rank, sometimes named, and sometimes indicated by initials; and on Robert Browning and Mrs. Browning. Lord Rosslyn writes throughout as a devout Christian, but we confess that the comprehensiveness of his hagiology surprises us. The strain in which he writes of Lord Beaconsfield differs widely from the strain in which Lord Beaconsfield himself, even when most distinctively Christian, as in various places of his *Lothair*, ever wrote or could have been imagined to write. In his second sonnet he writes:—

"From 'Golden Gate'  
 And fair 'Italian Terrace' where but late  
 He walked, to Jasper Doors and paths of light,  
 And all the marvels of celestial might,  
 Is blessed change for one who doubted Fate  
 That jars with Faith, content to work and wait  
 Till God shall bring his hidden things to sight."

Admiral Rous is made to be a "trainer of his generation," and to—

"Teach a moral none should e'er forget—  
 To live uprightly is to die content."

The sonnet in memory of Mrs. Browning is graceful and tender, though not exactly orthodox in all its meaning. But the sonnets to the author's wife seem to us to be much the best in the book, full of love, and trust, and melody. On the whole, the volume contains much pleasing and natural poetry, and bespeaks for the writer the esteem and kindly regard of his readers. In its catholicity of friendliness and generous kindliness of spirit, it somewhat reminds us of Lord Ronald Gower's autobiographical reminiscences. As to both noblemen, it is evident that time and circumstance have dealt very kindly with them, and that "the lines have fallen to them in pleasant places."

#### AMERICAN FICTION.

Never has England for many years had so little to boast of in the literature of fiction as to-day. It is no wonder therefore if, tired of sensationalism, perhaps immorality, or insipidity, as the case may be, there has been a disposition to turn to America and seek for fiction, at once fresh and innocent, if such may be found, from American sources. Mr. David Douglas, of Edinburgh, has thought this a seasonable opportunity, accordingly, for issuing a series of volumes of light literature by American writers. Nothing can be more elegant than the style and get-up of these shilling volumes. In respect of taste and execution nothing is left to be desired. Such excellent taste and such remarkable cheapness will, of themselves, go far to direct public attention favourably to the series. But, besides, there is much that is piquant and full of interest, especially to an Englishman, in the volumes which Mr. Douglas thus offers to us.

Speaking generally, these books are saturated throughout with a Bostonian flavour. This applies especially to Mr. Howells' books. Some of them—as, for instance, *Out of the Question* and *The Undiscovered Country*—are descriptions of Bostonians and New England, by a Bostonian pen, including the spiritualistic and mesmeric views of Bostonian life, and satirize, more or less, the whims and exclusiveness of the New England city. They may be slight, and they certainly indicate no affluence of knowledge or breadth of experience on the part of the writer; but they are carefully and cleverly written, and, if carefully read, will be found

more suggestive as to the real peculiarities of New England life and society, when compared with England, than any hastily written traveller's notes. Miss Blanche Willis Howard's *One Summer* may be classed with these. Others of Mr Howells' works, written after he had enlarged and carried forward his own education by travels in America and residence in Europe, describe Bostonians as they stand sharply discriminated on their travels, chiefly in Europe, especially Italy. *Venetian Life*, however, is not a novel, but a careful, descriptive, and, in part, historical account of Venice, as it was under the latest Austrian rule, Mr. Howells having been for some years American Consul at Venice. *Italian Journeys*, also, is not a novel, but a capital book of travel. *Their Wedding Journey* is little more than the description of a tour—the tour of a newly married pair—not, however, in Europe, but throughout America, including Canada. The travellers carry Boston ideas with them everywhere. Perhaps all the more for that, the volume is full of fresh interest to an English reader. Indeed, the thoroughly American character of all these books is a grand feature in their favour. The range is the narrower for it, but the painting is the sharper and more vivid. *The Lady of Aroostook* takes its place among the best of Mr. Howells' work. Its scenery is placed wholly either on shipboard or on European shores. *A Foregone Conclusion*, which is, perhaps, to be placed yet higher in the scale than the last-named fiction, and which includes much that is pathetic or even tragic in its interest, is a tale in which Boston is implicated with Italy. We have not named all, but we have named the best of Mr. Howells' tales, except *A Modern Instance*, which may possibly be his masterpiece, but is not included in this cheap and elegant series. As to the clearness and finish of Mr. Howells' characters, and as to the chaste elegance of his style, there is not, so far as we know, a second opinion. Perhaps some day writers will arise in all the different sections of the States who will depict to us America at home, in its provincial varieties, and in the contrast of State with State, or at least section with section. But something more and better than a universal superficial elementary education is necessary for America before such a result can be attained. It is well that voluntary effort, and especially enlightened Church zeal and enterprise, are multiplying the number of higher schools and colleges in the United States.

*Old Creole Days*, by G. W. Cable, is an attempt to do for New Orleans what we have just described as desirable for the country at large. The sketches of New Orleans life and society, half a century ago, are cleverly drawn, and unlike anything else in the world. But they are—perhaps they could hardly help being—in themselves very far from attractive pictures. New Orleans in 1820—part French, part Spanish, part American—must have been a very quaint place, with high colours and deep shadows amid its sensuous sunshine; but it was much the reverse of a safe or virtuous place, or a desirable habitation for a man of sober temper and right principles. Mr. Cable's writing is occasionally striking

for its local peculiarity, as, for instance, in the use of *dove* for *dived*. We wonder whether England will ever adopt that "strong" form of preterite tense.

*Winter Sunshine*, by John Burroughs, is the book, not of a novelist, but of a naturalist, a pedestrian, a traveller. It is a charming book, full of the ripe fruits of observation both as to Nature and society, as to different countries and nations, and the country itself everywhere. It is a wise and good book; only we are sorry for a naturalist and lover of bird-music who, in October, undertook to test the powers of such English song-birds as the blackbird and thrush, and to compare them with the birds of his own country. Let Mr. Burroughs do England and himself the simple justice to visit us not later than the middle of June. Then he will have some right to speak on this subject.

*Rudder Grange* is a very curious book, of characteristic and not coarse American humour, but sometimes more foolish than amusing.

---

## MISCELLANEOUS.

### *The Literature of the Fisheries' Exhibition.*

EVERY railway stall reminds us that the Fisheries' Exhibition has bred a literature of its own. We have before us nearly thirty pamphlets and handbooks of from 20 to 120 pages, and of course (though all are "issued by authority") of all degrees of scientific value. All of both kinds are published by Messrs. Clowes, and all are patterns of excellence in the matter of paper and printing; while names like those which face us on many of them are a sufficient guarantee of their value. It is a remarkable feature of the present day that *savans* are no longer content with the laboratory and the study; they come forward and appeal to the public, and they always find a public ready to listen if they have anything worth saying. The man who can give a certain opinion on such important points as "How can we increase our fish supply?" "Do any of the existing methods tend to lessen it?" "How can the economic condition of fishermen be improved?" is sure to be gratefully listened to. The worst of it is that the trumpets often give an uncertain sound; or, if one blows on one note, there soon comes from another a counterblast, just as strong, just as confident, leaving us poor "laymen" in doubt which to listen to. This is notably the case in regard to trawling. Everybody knows the controversy on this subject; but it seems to have been as barren of results as some theological controversies. Some men—Mr. Huxley, for instance—think trawling does no harm, rather good. Mr. Sims, however, a practical trawler, in the discussion which follows Mr. Ansell's paper on Trawling,

prophesied that before long the sole would be a thing of the past, and the plaice as scarce as the salmon, unless a close time was fixed for these fish as has been done for salmon. Not on Yarmouth beach alone can you see the men picking out the baby-fish, soles half as long as one's finger, and turbot as big as one's thumb-nail—dead, all of them, too, for they die when once they get into the net. On the coast of Jutland the young plaice, also dead, "are shovelled overboard by the ton." Mr. Sims's conclusion is that there are as many soles caught now as there were fifty years ago; but they are about a fiftieth of the weight. The only practical suggestions were rather old ones, "make the meshes bigger," and "do away with inshore trawling, and above all with shrimp-ing;" but this last was met by the objection that shrimpers have a right to live, though they have not (like the bigger trawlers) scientists to plead for them. On one point, not only those present at the lecture on trawling, but every one in the fish trade seems agreed, that the railway charges are far too high. Fish can never be carried as cheaply as coal; but there is no reason why it should cost more in transit than American beef. It is to be hoped that when "the outcome of the Exhibition" comes to be published, some more definite opinion on this very important question of trawling will be formulated. In the paper on "The Basis for Fishery Legislation," read by Lieut.-Col. Garcia Solá, the mischiefs of trawling are treated as unquestionable—herbage that serves for food for some, for shelter for other species, torn up; myriads of germs and young fry macerated by dragging among the entangled weed; not even the most prolific kinds can stand against this. Then the fish thus caught are of less value than those taken in floating nets or by the hook; they are almost always bruised, and therefore liable to early putrefaction. Inshore trawling has, we are assured, killed the fish in many places along the Spanish coast. Prof. Ray Lankester thinks we want more knowledge before we can legislate; but the Duke of Argyll is not alone in asserting that whitebait are young herring, and that therefore the whitebait fisheries must seriously tell on the number of herrings; and as an instance of undoubted mischief through want of a close time may be named the mussel which, sought for for bait by the trawlers all along our east coasts, is getting quite scarce. Even in Canada the need of protection is felt; and Mr. Goode, Assistant-Director of the United States Museum, in his paper on Fishery Industries in the United States, points to the abandonment by the halibut of Massachusetts Bay as one instance of the results of over-fishing. Dr. F. Day raises the same cry about the Indian sea fisheries. Crustaceans need special protection, owing to their slow growth and their comparative rareness. There is abundant evidence that the supply has been wholly exhausted in places where there was not long ago an abundant harvest. Even Mr. T. Cornish, whose paper on Crustaceans is a valuable scientific lecture, who knows every British crab and lobster, and has studied in Mount's Bay the rarer kinds which are really strangers

from the Mediterranean, and who laughs at the idea of general protection, "for there is," he says, "off the Land's End, one solid bed of crab and lobster deep-sea fishing ground, of at least 200 square miles, which will be exhausted much about the time the coal of England is exhausted," is quite assured of the need of strict protection in limited areas, unless we are satisfied to lose the fish in those areas altogether. There is no doubt of the need of protection; the doubt is, what kind of protection is best. As to the trawler, Mr. Fryer, in advocating a National Fishery Society, distinctly says that trawling does good. It cannot hurt the cod spawn, which floats on the surface; and if it does bring up a little herring spawn, it also clears the bottom of starfish, "tingles," and other destructive creatures. True, the fisherman often foolishly cuts the starfish in two, and flings it in again, thus doubling by his own act the number of his enemies; but the trawl has done its work; and the fisher has only to carry the starfish and other rubbish home, and use them on his potato patch, to ensure a twofold benefit. He even argues that the meshes of the trawl-net are best as they are: "were they made larger, the smallest sole of all, *Solea minuta*, which never attains a length of above three or four inches, would be left to multiply unchecked, consuming the food on which the more valuable species live." We quote this in order to show how almost every point connected with the subject is *adhuc sub judice*. The Commission of twenty years ago declined to interfere with trawling; though as yet local rules were in force, some of which the Duke of Argyll said told very unfairly on the Highland fishermen. This need of information is shown in the absurd legislation of bygone times. It will scarcely be credited that in George I.'s day, the close time for salmon in England was fixed between the end of June and the middle of November—i.e., the open time began just at the period when the fish spawn!

In regard to fish-supply, the culture of coarse fish, especially carp, is interesting because it has been so successfully carried out in Germany, one instance being that of Von der Borue, the well-known pisciculturist, who got more than 80,000 fine young carp in the autumn, after putting 500 parent fish into his ponds in the spring. Here, as Mr. T. C. Bloomfield says, is work for Ireland. Cultivate your coarse fish in the mountain lakes, whose trout is not worth eating, and send them to Manchester and Liverpool as fast-day fare for the Irish population. Round London, too, the culture is all the more needed, because swans (which have multiplied greatly) and steam launches are so destructive to these summer-spawners, while comparatively they do no harm to the winter-spawning *Salmonidæ*. Closely connected with this is the question of sewage. There are plenty of other reasons for excluding sewage and the refuse of dye and paper and other works from our rivers; but one certainly is the deterioration, if not destruction, of the fish. The Hon. Massey Mainwaring has some very discouraging remarks on sewage farms; the whole of Kent, he says, would be required to utilize the sewage

of London for anything more profitable than Italian rye-grass. At the same time, he is sure that sewage is bad for fish, albeit they are often attracted to the mouths of sewers. The Egyptian cholera he holds to be due, to a great extent, to the unwholesomeness of the fish, on which the people largely live, and which is made unfit for human use through feeding in waters that are "a vast mass of animal and human corruption." Happily he has a remedy, the extension by Mr. Sillar of Mr. Moule's well-known earth process, for which a patent has been taken out by the Aylesbury Native Guano Company. Their system, which may be seen at work in the Exhibition (Catalogue, No. 798), will, it is hoped, solve the sewage difficulty. And that the difficulty is a serious one the Rev. Mr. M'Alister's words in the discussion may well remind us. He has for twenty years noticed the effect of the N.E. winds blowing the foul smell from Crossness towards Plumstead and Woolwich; "the health of the inhabitants gradually falls; the whole life seems below par; there is a lassitude and loss of appetite, which doctors treat with quinine; he, a very healthy man, always felt it, and wanted a trip to Brighton or somewhere to set him up." Now the important point is, can the Guano Company deal with the whole sewage which is now poured into the Thames at Crossness? The general opinion seemed to be that it can, and at a profit. The legislation on the subject has not been encouraging. When the cholera first visited us, the cry was, "Close up the cesspools." This was done, under heavy penalties, in all towns within fifteen miles of London, the sewage being turned into the river, till the next outbreak came. Then attention was turned to the fearfully polluted state of the Thames and its affluents, and laws were passed to compel the riparian towns to deal otherwise with their sewage, London itself building, at an enormous cost, the high-level sewer which discharges at Crossness. This is now found to be by no means an efficient remedy; and, after a commission of inquiry, which cost nearly £30,000, and settled absolutely nothing, the hopelessly inefficient Local Government Board is glad to look for help to this Aylesbury Guano Company, with its "A B C process," which, instead of requiring the large tracts needed for sewage farms, is content with a very small bit of ground, and claims to secure almost perfect purity in the effluent water. As to artificial breeding, it must not be forgotten that, while salmon fry must get down to the sea, and may there not improbably be wholly lost to those who hatched them, the young of trout, and other non-migratory *Salmonidæ*, may be watched as carefully as lambs in a fold. It is instructive to note how all things in the economy of Nature work together. The supply of fish, for instance, is shown in the paper read by Mr. D. Howitz, the Danish Commissioner, to depend on the preservation of forests. Recklessly cut down your trees, you not only lessen the water supply, but you deprive the fish of their chief nourishment—decayed leaves, and the insects that come with them. Sir H. Thompson's paper on "Fish as Food" is naturally one of the most interesting of the series. It is full of infor-

mation, telling us that conger is the basis of all the choicest turtle soup; explaining that the reason why fish is the best diet for sedentary people is, not because it contains any brain stimulant, such as phosphorus, but because it has less fat and less albuminoid flesh-forming elements; showing how fish may best be cooked, by roasting it in its own gravy in a Dutch or American oven. We are glad such an eminent authority recognizes the value of the West country fish-pie—of slices of fish mixed with lumps of bacon or fat pork to supply the necessary fat. In the discussion, Dr. Cobbold gave an emphatic warning about thoroughly cooking all fish, especially salmon and trout: *it is these that are the source of the great tupe-worm*. We may be allowed to add that the value of fish as food for sedentary people depends mainly on the cooking. As it is too often sent to table, it is of all foods the most indigestible.

But we must draw our remarks to a close, recommending our readers to be sure to get Mr. Bertram's *Unappreciated Fisher-Folk*, and Mr. H. Lee's *Sea Monsters Unmasked*, the two most generally amusing of the handbooks. Of these, the former contains a very good account (taken from the well-known Mr. Couch, of Polperro) of the pilchard-catchers, and of the Scotch and Irish fishermen. The latter are, it seems, sadly handicapped in all directions. They have in most places no proper gear, their boats and machinery of capture are of the most fragile description; they are most of them at a prohibitive distance from good markets, and if they had better boats, there are no fitting harbours to receive them. In June, 1881, forty-nine boxes, each containing 120 fine mackerel, were sent up to Dublin from Cork county. The cost of transit was £12 16s., and the balance remitted to the senders was £1 17s. 11d.—about a farthing for three fish! And yet Mr. Spencer Walpole, in the teeth of Mr. Brady's evidence, and despite the very encouraging reports of Baroness Burdett-Coutts' "reproductive loan fund," tells people that the Irish fisheries ought to do very well without help, that it is rather disgraceful of them to ask for it, seeing the English have got on so wonderfully without it. The book on *Sea Monsters* contains all the sea-serpent lore, and facts enough to warrant Victor Hugo in his thrilling account of the *pieuvre*. Among the sensational pictures, one of a Japanese boat attacked by an octopus is exceedingly curious; so is one of the calamary, the modern representative of the plesiosaurus. Besides all these pamphlets, there are plenty of books on the subject, among which we may instance Mr. Holdsworth's *Sea Fisheries of Great Britain and Ireland* (Stanford). It contains in a compact form a good account of fishing as it is, with descriptions and illustrations of the various kinds of nets. We trust that the intellectual impetus which has been given to the subject will not be suffered to pass away, but that some real good in the way of better nourishment to our people, as well as better acquaintance with the finny tribes, will be one of the results of the Exhibition.

*Iberian Reminiscences: Fifteen Years' Travelling Impressions of Spain and Portugal.* By A. GALLENGA. Two vols. London: Chapman & Hall.

Gratitude to the anonymous letter writer, who, having read "The Summer Tour in Russia," sent just the one line, "I hope Spain will be your next work," is the feeling with which we lay down these very interesting volumes. Signor Gallenga is no mere tourist, tabulating the chance impressions and third-hand information picked up in a hasty run. Long residences in Spain during the fifteen years from 1865-79 have made him familiar with almost every part of the country; and, as a native of the neighbouring peninsula, he takes a special interest in Spanish prospects. His feeling is that "there never can be any real progress in Europe till she stands on better legs; and, if Germany is the thinking hand, France the impulsive heart, England and Russia the arms spread for action, the vital principle must reach the nether extremities, those three southern peninsulas by the aid of which the tour of the globe was first accomplished." He marks a great difference between Spain and the other two. They have been roused into new existence, but had sunk too deeply to rise as high as they wish or their friends expected. "It is only a pale dawn of bravely asserted but not thoroughly achieved independence. Europe had deposed them, Europe has restored them. . . . But Spain is self-standing, by the mere fact of her geographical position. . . . She never wholly lost the mastery over her own destinies. If her period of decline came so soon, if she has sunk now to so low a level, it was her own fault; alone she did it." Spanish pride helped the fall, or, rather, "that superlative conceit which made her unable to distinguish between defensive and offensive pride." Is this conceit, which gives an appetite for measureless flattery, a Basque characteristic? There is Basque blood in Cornwall, says Mr. Huxley, and their Devon neighbours look on the Cornish as of all Englishmen the most conceited. There is Basque blood in parts of Ireland, and some at least of that very mixed breed included under the name of Irishmen show both conceit and a strong appetite for flattery. Or, shall we say it is not race at all, but only isolation? In Spain, at any rate, it did not mean self-reliance. Her effort to help herself was grand; "it was that kind of daring to which heaven and earth never fail to bring help." But, independence won, she did not look to herself to reconstruct her social order; she borrowed ideas from her nearest neighbours, "echoing the French cries for Revolution, Constitution, Democracy; with all her hatred of the French, frenchifying herself from head to foot." Nay, she improved on her pattern; and though by no means a promising pupil in politics, she excelled her French teacher in militarism, the result being half a century of alternate tyranny and

anarchy, with a new ministry every three months, the difference between her and France being that her "saviour of society" has always been of native growth; "she has only succumbed to Napoleons of her own breeding."

Of this dreary time Signor Gallenga has not attempted a history; "that," he says, "is a task from which the most patriotic Spaniard would shrink with dismay at the difficulty, shame at the loathsomeness, of the task." What he does is to say something about politics when he is describing spots on which the crises of modern Spanish history have taken place. His estimate of the Spanish character is very fair. He is quite right in remarking that its faults are mostly due to the exaggeration of its virtues. Disdain of what is base and mean leads to vaingloriousness; the abstemiousness that makes men indifferent to comforts and luxuries makes them unenterprising and slothful; and the Spanish have, in an exaggerated degree, that tendency, common to all the so-called Latin races, to lay their own faults on their Government, "not seeing to what an extent identity must in all cases be established between a nation and its rulers." "Loyalty and devotion were the mother's milk in which the Spanish kid was smothered;" and now, by a strange reaction, "the people, schooled by all these traditions of the past, have been brought to look on the Government, no matter what it is, as their enemy." The best men keep out of office, convinced that no official can help being "a partaker of iniquity;" and hence politics have become a trade. "A pack of four or five hundred *pastejeros* (*piemen*) have invaded the high places, and made themselves indispensable and irreplaceable as party leaders, the people looking on and suffering themselves to be kicked from side to side with more than Eastern apathy." And as the State is full of greedy placemen, so the army is of useless officers. Universal suffrage has proved a delusion; "with every extension of the franchise there has been a falling-off of voters at the polls." The Chamber is so manipulated that every decently able minister can be certain how it will vote. Every man worth buying has his price; altogether a discouraging state of things, especially as the reorganization of the Church is even more difficult than the reconstruction of the State, and as "a Cortes has never been anything better than a spouting club." The few healthy symptoms are the growth of mining industry (chiefly, we think, thanks to foreign capital); the pushing forward of public works; the rise in the funds from 15, and even 12, to 45, and the consequent hope of rescue from national bankruptcy. Signor Gallenga wisely abstains from any prophecy; he reminds us that his aim is descriptive, not political, and he contents himself with noting the uneasy attitude of the nation because it is shut out from European councils—is not asked, for instance, to say a word about the Eastern Question and the Suez Canal. Spain would welcome any ruler, no matter how despotic, who could replace her in her old position.

But, though he declines to be called a political writer, our author does manage, amid descriptions of new as well as of well-known scenes, to give us a very clear insight into the puzzle of Spanish politics. Of course he has a good deal to say about Queen Isabella, noting how, despite her loyalty to the Roman faith, she allowed the Pope's temporal domains to be seized without even a protest, though sixteen years before she had sent a strong force to the Tiber, where it had played jackal to Napoleon III.'s lion in the task of maintaining the integrity of the Papal States. But it is in the chapters about O'Donnell and Prim, and in that headed, "Life in Revolutionary Madrid," that his thorough acquaintance with what he writes about is most strongly felt. For the first time in his life the reader takes an interest in quarrels which before had seemed like "the battles of kites and crows."

In his descriptive parts he is always delightful. Even to such a well-worn subject as the Alhambra, he gives the charm of freshness without in the least affecting singularity. Newer to most readers will be the scenes on the French frontier during the Carlist war. M. Gallenga is very indignant that, though gambling was illegal, a Frenchman, named Dupressoir, started a *rouge et noir* table, with all the accessories, at Fontarabia. He declaims against the gambling-house as an exclusively French institution; and draws an amusing contrast between the Cura of Fontarabia, who, invited to attend the ceremony of inauguration and to bless the house, replied: "The former owner was a good Christian, therefore the house had certainly already been blessed." ("To hallow a hell!" was his remark in private, "not if I know it"), and the dapper young French priest of Hendaye, "who was won by the devotional munificence of the grand croupier, that worthy sending the band from the kiosk to play and sing at mass, and himself putting a 50f. note on the offertory plate. This Carlist war was much more destructive than its insignificance warranted; it was only "the mad freak of a royal adventurer," and the Basques, so far from being enthusiastic, were only anxious to be left alone.

Of the future of Barcelona, Signor Gallenga augurs well. It will, he thinks, beat its rivals on the Mediterranean, Genoa and Marseilles, for it has the advantage of being a Liverpool and Manchester in one, and it gained by the calamities which came in the wake of the Carlist insurrection, the well-to-do inhabitants flying thither for refuge, and the industries of the ravaged districts being transported to the city or its suburbs. The Barcelonese delighted our author by their aptness at enjoying themselves; he was there one Christmas, and says that for a whole week they thought of nothing else.

Several chapters are devoted to Don Alfonso and his Court, and several to Portugal, the contrast between Lisbon, the city of dulness, and Madrid, the city of noise, being well drawn. The Portuguese, he thinks, "have, of all European nations, achieved the least for the advancement of

modern art;" but then he is severe all round, as is seen by the following: "Spain ripened three centuries after Italy, and she sunk at once into that rottenness into which Italy had glided by imperceptible stages." This very severity, however, inasmuch as it is not merely epigrammatic, gives value to his criticism; he is never afraid to speak out.

One passage specially interesting to English readers is the account of the Duke of Wellington's splendid estate of La Torre, near Grenada, once held by Richard Wall—Charles III.'s Irish minister—then by Godoy, then by Joseph Bonaparte, and given to the great Duke in 1814. When our author saw it, it was under the management of an Englishman, whom he calls Don Horacio, and whose difficulties resembled those of an Irish agent anxious to bring about real improvement on a neglected property.

*The Citizen Series.—Local Government.* By M. D. CHALMERS, M.A., Barrister-at-Law. London: Macmillan & Co.

The promoters of the "Citizen Series" have been happy in the selection of writers on the various subjects included in their scheme, and the volume before us is no exception to the rule. It contains an amount of accurate and carefully arranged information with reference to the various branches of Local Government in the country, which is, perhaps, not to be found within the same compass in any other work. It is not so much an essay as a handbook, and will be chiefly useful as a book of reference, whilst it abounds with strange facts which cannot fail to interest the general reader. The impression it leaves on the mind is one of bewilderment at the complicated and anomalous forms of government under which we live, and a deep conviction that the entire system of local government needs to be recast and simplified. The chapters are headed: Introductory; General View; the Parish; the Union; the Municipal Borough; the County; the Sanitary District; the School District; the Highway Area, &c.; the Metropolis; and Central Control; and the provisions of the various Acts of Parliament now in force under these different heads are briefly explained. With reference to the existing state of things, the author says: "Local government in this country may be fitly described as a chaos of areas, a chaos of authorities, and a chaos of rates;" and Mr. Goschen says, "there is no labyrinth so intricate as the chaos of our local laws." Our author continues: "Mr. Rathbone stated in the House of Commons that in the place where he lived there were no less than thirty-five different local authorities. . . . The total number of local authorities who tax the English ratepayer is 27,069, and they tax him by means of eighteen different rates" (p. 18). "The inhabitant of a borough lives in a fourfold area for purposes of local government—namely, in the borough, in a parish, in a union, and in a county; none of these are conterminous, unless by accident, with any of the others; and

different parts of the borough are, or may be, in different parishes, and in different unions, and in different counties. He is, or may be, governed by a sixfold authority—the municipal council, the vestry, the school board, the burial board, the guardians, and the county quarter sessions" (p. 20). In like manner the inhabitant of a local board district, or of a rural parish, lives in four kinds of district and is under six kinds of government. "Each petty board or authority," Mr. Chalmers remarks, "must have its own staff and officers kept up at the expense of the ratepayers, however unnecessary this may be for the purpose of doing the work. Confusion and extravagance are the characteristic features of the whole system. The consequent waste of time, power and money is immense. Reform appears to be required in two directions—first, the simplification of areas; and second, the consolidation of authorities" (pp. 21, 22).

The complications of local government are tabulated on pp. 29–31, under five heads—viz., Date of Election for Different Authorities, Scale of Voting, Tenure of Office, Method of Election, and Qualification of Candidates. The table is too long to transfer to our pages, but it is well worthy of study. The anomalies of parish boundaries are also very confusing. In many cases there are outlying lands, separated from the mother parish by a considerable distance. In 1873 there was a parish in Yorkshire which had no less than ten portions cut off from it, and surrounded by the lands of other parishes. The number of these divided parishes is above 1,300. On the other hand, there is a farm of 200 acres in Gloucestershire which, a few years ago, was partly situated in twelve parishes and subject to about fifty rates. Some parishes are very extensive and some very small. Some have a large population; whilst in Northumberland there are several containing only five or six persons; and one is mentioned in which there is only one ratepayer! Of 15,000 civil parishes, there are 5,000 whose boundaries do not coincide with the ecclesiastical parishes of the same name. The rapid accumulation of local debts, for which the ratepayers are responsible, is also deserving of careful attention. The total amount is already £144,000,000; and it increases at an average rate of £8,000,000 a year. The National Debt is about £700,000,000; and the present Government has originated a scheme for paying it off in seventy-five years; but even if this should be adopted and successfully carried out, we shall, at the end of the period, have another debt, not the less national because it is unequally distributed, of £744,000,000! It is of vast importance that the British taxpayer should be fully enlightened on such points as these.

We also commend the following trenchant passage on pauperism to the notice of our readers:—"Our noble army of paupers cost us nearly £9,000,000 (annually). The main strength of our force of adult able-bodied paupers is about 105,000. . . . It seems a pity that we cannot have an annual review of our able-bodied paupers. It would be a more

imposing (!) spectacle than any military pageant that England has ever seen. If their big battalions could be made to march past the representatives of the ratepayers, some drastic legislation would probably be the result!" (pp. 27, 28). Our next extract will no doubt prove interesting to the advocates of woman's rights. A woman cannot vote at a parliamentary election, or be a member of the House of Commons; but she may exercise all local franchises, and hold the following amongst other offices: "commissioner of sewers, governor of a workhouse, keeper of a prison, gaoler, parish constable, returning officer for a parliamentary election, guardian, and overseer of the poor!" (p. 11). From the chapter on sanitary districts we take one little item: "It may be noted that the court rolls of Stratford-on-Avon show that in 1552 Shakspeare's father was fined for depositing filth in the public street in violation of the by-laws of the manor, and again in 1558 for not keeping his gutter clean!" (p. 165). We have no doubt that the volume will be welcomed by the public as a very useful compendium, and hope that it will have a wide circulation. We must conclude our remarks by suggesting two corrections. The word "monies" is often so spelt, but in violation nevertheless of a very useful grammatical rule. The date 1782 on page 108 obviously means 1872, as the Act to which it refers was passed in that year.

*Colonies and Dependencies* is another volume of the "The English Citizen Series," which is intended to supply information on the ordinary conditions and the current terms of our political life. Messrs. Macmillan are the publishers; Mr. Craik the editor. In this volume J. S. Cotton writes on India; E. J. Payne on the Colonies. Mr. Cotton gives a valuable sketch of India, its government, its political constitution and financial administration, and shows that we have taught India the lessons of industrial prosperity and of constitutional freedom, and have thus "in one sense sapped the foundations of our own supremacy." The future of India is very difficult to foresee, but all its progress in the hands of wise home government will only increase our own progress and success. The part of the book which treats of our colonial empire, gives a complete sketch of the way in which our colonies were acquired, their government, their administrative chambers, their exports, &c. It will be found to be a very useful book of reference for all matters affecting our colonies and their relations to the empire. Both parts of this volume are written by men of clear judgment and of full information, and will be very valuable to all students of matters relating to India and the colonies.

*The Student's Encyclopædia of Universal Knowledge.* A Scientific and Popular Treasury of Useful Information, containing full and clearly written Articles by Eminent Specialists. In 6 volumes. London: Hodder and Stoughton. 1883.

It is hard to exaggerate the value of a work like this, supposing it to be well executed. The object aimed at being to occupy a place intermediate between the ordinary dictionary and the complete encyclopædia, it is obvious that success depends on the satisfaction of many conditions. The most difficult of these are the right medium between too much fullness and scantiness or superficiality: bringing information up to the current level of knowledge; keeping up a general unity and uniformity of treatment; and avoidance of particular or subjective views. When these hard conditions are fairly met, the result must be a work of singular importance in any well-furnished library: a book of reference to which one can turn for a certain measure of help, on a thousand occasions, with assurance of not being disappointed. During the months that this *Student's Encyclopædia* has been growing on our shelves, we have found it on almost every appeal a faithful friend, either informing or refreshing the memory; and now that it is complete, can recommend it with great confidence.

To begin such an elaborate work *de novo* would be an impossible and a needless task: one at least that could not be accomplished within any reasonable limits of expense. The *Globe Encyclopædia* has here furnished the foundation, and some of the most competent specialists have contributed to adapt it to modern requirements. Those requirements are very exacting in Physical Science; and accordingly great pains have been taken with the mathematical articles, which are admirable; as also with the exhibition of the latest results of experiment and observation, as the article on Electricity, for instance, shows. Nor have Theology and Philosophy any reason to complain. The Biographical Notices are, on the whole, good; and have the advantage of including many living celebrities. The short memoirs of Clerk-Maxwell and Spottiswoode may perhaps have the noble end of their career inserted before the present issue is sent out; and in that case, "Second Wrangler" must be the correction in the case of the former.

The title "*Student's Encyclopædia*" is well-advised and well-deserved. We recommend all students with whom we have any influence to put the set speedily on their shelves.

## SUMMARIES OF FOREIGN PERIODICALS.

**REVUE DES DEUX MONDES** (15th July).—The first place in this number is given to the closing part of a clever story by M. Bentzou ("Tête Folle").—M. Bardoux contributes a paper on the "Ministry of the Comte de Montmorin during the Revolution." He defends the noble minister, and attempts to show his true character. Public opinion has judged Montmorin more harshly than any of the other Ministers of Louis XVI. The Jacobins hated him more than the greatest aristocrats, because he struggled more against the enemies of the king. "No personal danger," he said once, "shall ever hinder me from doing that which I believe to be useful to his majesty." M. Bardoux divides his ministry into three periods—the first, when he desired to establish, in France, a constitution resembling that of England; the second period, when he saw that the heart of France was set on "equality," and tried with Mirabeau to arrest excesses and create a moderate party; the third period, in which, having failed to save royalty, he concentrated all his efforts to save the person of the king.—M. Charles Lavollée reviews Mr. John Morley's "Life of Richard Cobden," and pays ungrudging tribute to the great statesman's memory. "To see in Cobden," he says, "only the chief of the league which has made the principle of liberty of exchanges and the negotiator of the treaty of commerce between France and England, is only half to see him. These acts, great as they are, do not give his full measure. Cobden was the indefatigable advocate of peace. He was the author of numerous reforms, the founder of social progress, and of a kind of democratic revolution in a society ruled and served at the same time by the aristocracy."—M. Jules Girard reviews M. Bouché Leclercq's translation of "Curtius' Greek History" with warm appreciation of its high merits, both as a scholarly and a living artistically composed history, but with a lingering regret that the translator had not devoted himself to original historic writing, and thus given France herself a good historian of Greece.—There is also an able paper on the "Catacombs of Rome," full of interesting facts.—M. Radau has an article on dresses and houses in relation to the atmosphere. He feels the question to be very wide, and one needing new researches, but he hopes that his article may awake inquiry. Some curious facts about dress materials and temperature are given in the article.—Musical and dramatical reviews, &c., fill up a number of great general interest.

**REVUE DES DEUX MONDES** (1st August).—M. Chas. de Mazade continues his series of historical studies, entitled "Fifty years of Contemporary History." Six articles on this period have already appeared in earlier numbers of the Review. The present article is devoted to M. Thiers, and the part he took in the political crisis after the Franco-German war. It was M. Thiers' wish to save all parties from mutual jealousies and discords. "I have not any other care; I have not any other work from morning till night. I belong to none of the parties." M. de Mazade pays high tribute in his article to the patriotism of M. Thiers. From first to last Thiers was always a patriot. He loved his country with passion, not the country straitened or disfigured by parties, but the country of all time, of all régimes, the country of Condé, of Vauban, and Turenne, as well as of the Revolution and of Napoleon. He kept the national greatness with pride in good days, and he kept it with generous and ardent steadfastness in evil times.—M. Maxime du Camp, of the Académie Française, contributes a fourth article on a most interesting subject. "The Private Charity of France." He pays high tribute to the noble work of the Daughters of Charity, who go about the streets in winter nights seeking to rescue destitute children. There are 126 charitable houses in Paris, where 10,180 children are maintained, instructed, and taught a trade. L'Orphelinat des Apprentis was founded by l'Abbe Roussel, who one night, at the end of the winter of 1865, found a child turning over a heap of dirt. "What do you do there?" he said. The child answered, "I seek something to eat."

Roussel took it home. Next day he searched and found another; eight days after he had six of these waifs of Paris in his rooms. So began a great work of charity which has been active for seventeen years, reclaiming thousands of little vagabonds, instructing them by elementary classes, and giving them a start in life.—The great Palace of Schifanoia, at Ferrara, built in 1391, by the brother of Nicholas II., is described by Gustave Gruyer.—M. Auguste Langel writes on Coligny; and there are various other interesting papers, political and literary notices, &c.

Some chapters of Herr Kielland's serial story, "Gift," &c., will well repay perusal.

REVUE DES DEUX MONDES (15th August).—The second part of M. Loti's story, "Mon Frère Yves," heads this number.—M. Gabriel Charmes writes about the military insurrection in Egypt. He describes the circumstances which led up to Arabi's revolt, and shows how he won his ascendancy over the troops. Arabi knew the Koran from one end to the other; his only other book was an Arab History of Napoleon I., which awoke in him the fatal desire to imitate that great soldier.—An article on "Human Solidarity and the Rights of the Individual," and M. Barloux's paper on the Countess of Beaumont and her family during the Reign of Terror, deserve attention.—M. Bourdeau writes about Joseph Victor von Scheffel, whom his countrymen honour with such enthusiasm as the echo of the Germanic spirit. His broad humour, his passion for learning, his enthusiasm for Nature, are typical of the Germany of the South, and make the study of his poems a valuable help towards understanding the national character.—"Bankers and Banks" gives an interesting account of the leading banking houses of France, and discusses financial questions of great moment.

REVUE DES DEUX MONDES (September 1).—Pierre Loti's tale, "My Brother Yves," is a sad account of the power of drinking habits over a good sailor, and the trouble they caused in his home. It is to be finished in the next number.—M. Janet writes on the education of women. He describes the great progress made, and criticizes the various schemes for female education in a thoughtful and interesting way. The account of the military insurrection in Egypt is continued by a paper on "The Defeat and the Trial of Arabi." The march on Cairo after the fall of Tel-el-Kebir is pronounced to be a beautiful and dazzling military expedition; but the writer thinks that the trial of Arabi was a judicial comedy, and that our clemency has weakened our hold on the people's respect.—The article on Coligny traces his share in the religious wars of France, and describes his sad death in the massacre of St. Bartholomew.—The question of Tonquin, the life of Frederic William IV., and various other topics are also handled in this number of the REVIEW.

DEUTSCHE RUNDSCHAU (July).—Under the heading "A Trip in Northern Asia Minor," Professor Hirschfeld, of Königsberg, gives an account of a journey which he took in July, 1882, to Paphlagonia. He pays high tribute to the work which the English consuls have done in exploring the country, and gives a most interesting account of his own tour.—"The Age of Steel," by Herr Kranichfeld, shows that we are leaving the iron age, and have already lifted our foot to step into the new age of steel. Two Englishmen, Bessemer and C. G. Thomas, are the founders of this new era, which has given us steel rails, steel ships, steel bridges, steel wheels, &c. The work of these two inventors is here told by a keen and warmly appreciative critic.—Herr Rohlf's has a paper on "The Madagascar Embassy." He gives a sketch of the country, the people, the history of Madagascar, and thinks that although the French have bombarded two ports of Madagascar, an understanding will yet be reached. Herr Rohlf's also holds that our English desire of possessions in Egypt has helped to make the Madagascar question so acute. The surprising chase after new territory, which has marked France of late, is set down to our example!

DEUTSCHE RUNDSCHAU (August).—Herr Justi contributes an article on the Prince of Wales's (afterwards Charles I.) journey to Spain to see the sister of Philip IV., who was proposed as his bride. It appears that she was a lady of great personal attractions, and Buckingham wrote to James, "Without flattery, I

believe there is not a sweeter creature in the world." The Infanta remained quite unmoved when she saw Charles, and only asked her brother whether he was really a Catholic. "Never," she said, "will I marry a heretic, I would sooner take the veil." All the steps of that strange story are dwelt on in this charming article. In 1629 the Infanta married the son of the Emperor Ferdinand II., and died suddenly two years before the tragic death of Charles. Her brother was overpowered with grief when they told him that she was dead. "She was the apple of my eye, the comfort of my soul, my only hope on earth."—An article on the "Fiji Islands as British Colonies" pays high tribute to the vast development of commercial prosperity which has been gained under our rule, and holds it up as an example drawn from the conduct of the Englishman, ever prompt to appear on the field of action, which is interesting to all Germans in view of recent attempts to make German colonization a national matter.—Professor Von Urlicks tells the story of the friendship between Schiller and Fichte, the two greatest professors that the University of Jena has ever had.—Professor Sohucke writes about the condition and aims of physics, and recognizes the great strides which have been made in all problems of natural philosophy in the last few years. The vast fields yet unexplored will have to be opened up by specialists, who have also an eye to the connection of their own special branches of research with the great general aims of science.—The fiction is very good. "Gift," the romance by Herr Kielland, which has been appearing in monthly parts, is finished in this number of the REVIEW, and there are two stories entitled "Children's Tears," by Ernst von Wildenbruck.—A short article on the new temperance movement in Germany shows that the country is now taking its place in the great temperance movement of the century, from which it had held aloof for the last twenty or thirty years. Field Marshal Count Moltke was the first member of the "German Union against the Abuse of Spirituous Liquors."

DEUTSCHE RUNDSCHAU (September).—"Frau Antje," the short romance by Adalbert Meinhardt, which stands first in this month's REVIEW, is a pleasing and well-told story of a young man's return, after many years of life in foreign lands, to to his old home, in a little town of Holland.—Professor Rischel writes on that most-disputed subject, "The Home of the Gipsies." He thinks that further inquiries will throw new light on the question, but inclines to the Indian origin of the race, which is now so generally accepted.—Lady Blennerhassett describes Madame de Staël's relations to Germany. Her stay in Weimar and her connection with so many of the great men of Germany give special interest to this paper.—Prof. Hirschfeld contributes another descriptive account of his tour in Asia Minor. His first sight of the river Halys filled him with a kind of rapt-surprise. There are also papers on Prince Bismarck and the Liberal party, on the Stone Age, &c.

HARPER'S MAGAZINE (July).—"A Famous London Suburb" gives a charming account of Hampstead. The article is well illustrated. "The Romanoffs" is a sketch of the state of Russian society rather than of the Royal family.—"The second generation of Englishmen in America" gives a picture of the last half of the seventeenth century. One of the darkest features of Puritanism in that period was the "Witchcraft Trials." In 1602 nineteen persons were hanged and one "pressed to death" in these painful persecutions.—Mr. Ingram deals with the sad story of poor Chatterton.—There is a paper on Cincinnati, its great names and fine buildings.—Charles Reade contributes a short tale, "Born to Good Luck;" and other pleasant reading will be found in the number.

HARPER'S MAGAZINE (August).—"The Heart of the Alleghanies" is an interesting paper about Altoona, the great workshop for locomotives on the Pennsylvania Railway, where 6,500 hands are employed in the shops, and 100 locomotives and 73,000 wheels are turned out every year; about the great Pittsburgh glass manufacture, &c.—There is the chronicle of a visit to Vallombrosa, so famous by Milton's lines, and a very full and interesting sketch of the Crown Prince of Germany.—"The British Yoke" is an historical sketch of some of the events which led up to the declaration of independence.—Mr. Kelly's paper on "The Modern Yacht" is both interesting and appropriate for the great regatta season.—American yachts and American horses both have a place in this number.

**HARPER** (September).—This month's *Harper* is beautifully illustrated. The articles on Dalecarlia, the Swedish district 150 miles north of Stockholm, and on the Catskills, give abundant scope for such engravings and for much pleasant writing. The account of Paul Potter, the famous animal painter of Holland, who died at the early age of twenty-nine, is perhaps the most interesting article. His "Bull," preserved at the Hague, has been pronounced to be the finest animal painted. The man and the artist were alike admirable. "Recent Building in New York" is a somewhat technical discussion of the architectural merits of various pieces of work turned out by the architects and builders of New York in the last ten years, which have been marked by a kind of breaking-up of the old traditions of the building world.

**THE CENTURY MAGAZINE** (July).—Mr. Smalley gives some curious facts in his article on "Striking Oil," about the wonderful trade which has sprung up in the states of Pennsylvania and New York. The oil district is only about 150 miles long and one to twenty miles broad. The speculator who tries to find wells in districts not known to contain oil is called a "wild-catter," rich to-day, poor to-morrow, a man of all manner of shifts.—There is an interesting paper on rose production, called "Old and New Roses."—Mr. Morse contributes an article on "The Native Element in American Fiction since the War." He thinks that the American Thackeray or Scott, when he appears, will easily find all the character and variety in life around him which is needed to give full scope to the novelist.—There are articles on "Black Bass Fishing," and on the "John Brown Raid at Harper's Ferry in 1859," which began actual hostilities in the Southern States.—Henry James writes a critical sketch of "Anthony Trollope and his Works," which shows warm appreciation of Trollope's prolific genius. "He was strong, genial, and abundant." Nevertheless, he was too mechanical, and left his brain no rest.—W. D. Howells continues his story, "A Woman's Reason;" and there are many other interesting features in the magazine.

**THE CENTURY MAGAZINE** (August).—This month's is the Midsummer Holiday Number of the magazine. Mr. Mayer contributes a most interesting article on little "Bob White," the game bird (sometimes compared to the quail or partridge) so dear to the heart of American sportsmen.—Henry James has a paper on Alphonse Daudet, the gifted and finished writer who stands at the head of the French novel of manners. There is a splendid likeness of Daudet, and this article will well repay those who wish to gain some knowledge of one of the finest French writers of our day.—The present condition of the Mission Indians in Southern California; an article on Carlyle; an account of the Olive Tree and its Culture; an appreciative paper on Mr. Watts' Paintings at the Grosvenor; some capital stories and short poems, make up a most delightful holiday number.

**THE CENTURY MAGAZINE** (September) is full of interesting articles. One is on "Cape Cod and its Associations," another is the account of a Musk-Ox Hunt in 1879-80, in the country between North Hudson's Bay and the Arctic Ocean. Mr. Burroughs, the popular writer on natural history, contributes an article on "The Tragedies of the Nests," in which he describes the hair-breadth escapes by flood and field of the feathered tribe: "Very few of them probably die a natural death, or even live out half their appointed days."—Mr. W. C. Conant deals with a subject of great interest to both the Old and the New World: "Will New York be the final world metropolis?" The last sentence will sum up his views: "It is not rash to predict that, long before another century passes, the population of New York will surpass that of London, and that it will be the unrivalled centre of finance and commerce, of luxury and fashion, of art and literature—the heart and brain, in a word, of the civilized world.—Mr. Howells' story, "A Woman's Reason," is continued in this number.

The Quarterly Organ of the Great Methodist Episcopal Church of America, known as the **METHODIST QUARTERLY REVIEW** (July), opens with a sketch of the life and character of Robert L. Dashiell, D.D., President of Dickinson College, and afterwards one of the Missionary secretaries. It is a fine picture of a zealous and highly gifted man.—There is an article on Keble and the Tractarian movement, and a

sketch of the Ecumenical Conference, held at City Road, which dwells on the advantages of that great gathering. The writer complains of the small "practical sympathy British Methodists have had in work outside of themselves, especially in work on this side of the Atlantic." Any one who knows the enormous strain which comes on all the prominent men of English Methodism for Connexional work of every kind will understand the reasons for this. Other interesting articles and literary notices fill up this number of the REVIEW.

THE QUARTERLY REVIEW (July) of the American Methodist Episcopal Church, South, has recently passed into the hands of a new editor, Dr. Hinton, and deals with some of the most pressing questions of the day: "Co-Education of the Sexes," "Demands and Difficulties of Infidelity," "The Church and Education," &c.

THE AMERICAN BOOKSELLER (July 2, 1883) is a paper published twice a month to show all the current publications, books, magazines, stationery, &c., in America and Europe. It also gives facts about forthcoming books and literary gossip, with a list of recent patents relating to literary matters. The amount of activity in the literary world of Europe and America which this periodical represents is amazing.

An article on the French Newspaper Press, in the second and third number of the new series of the CORNHILL MAGAZINE (August and September), deserves perusal. Emile de Girardin caused a revolution in journalism when he started *La Presse* for a yearly subscription of four francs. Up to that time French newspapers had depended chiefly on the subscriptions which ranged from 80 francs to 120 francs a year. Girardin aimed at a wide circle of readers, which would induce advertisers to fill the columns, and secured by the end of the first twelvemonth a circulation of 230,000. He introduced the novel cut up into daily slices, and had such extensive advertisements that he won the nickname "Homme-Annonce," and "Homme-Affiche." The *Constitutionnel* paid 100,000 fr. for Eugene Sue's novel, the "Wandering Jew;" Alexandre Dumas hired himself out for 64,000 fr. a year, to one paper, and also undertook to supply the "Siècle" with 100,000 lines of copy a year, at the rate of 1fr. 50c. a line.—De Villemessant founded *Figaro* in 1854, and there is hardly a prominent journalist who has not been an apprentice under him. *Figaro* is the typical French paper; one third of its second page being taken up by some serial story. *Le Temps* is a Protestant and moderate Republican organ. It affects translations of English novels as of a higher moral tone, and more in harmony with its Protestant principles than most French novels. On Sunday a fine dramatic review, on Monday, a musical article, on Tuesday, a scientific record takes the place of the serial story. *Le Petit Journal*, a small folio sheet sold at 5 centimes, is the popular paper, and has a daily circulation of 650,000 copies. It publishes daily instalments of two sensational novels, is ably edited, and has contributed more than all the other French papers put together to secure the establishment of the present French Republic. The puffs which appear in the French Journals are such as no good English editor would admit, and the relations between journalists and theatrical managers go far to destroy independence of judgment.

CORNHILL (September).—The account of the French newspaper press, which is finished in this number, says that politics have crowded literary criticism out of the journals. It has become anecdotic and biographical. The papers simply praise or condemn, as a writer's opinions coincide with their own party spirit. Rapidity in publishing news is out of the question; the "local news" department is wretchedly conducted; adequate and thoroughly unbiassed reports of a public meeting can scarcely be had. Parliamentary reports are spiced to suit the French taste. Albert Milland, one of the cleverest wits of the day, and his assistants, dress up the reports for *Figaro*, and make the happy mixture of fact, criticism, anecdote and malice which is most acceptable to the public. The financial column is utterly unreliable. There is scarcely any journal which is not full of puffs, for which it receives large contributions. The regular staff of writers employed on *Figaro* is about twenty-five. The celebrities receive 1,500 francs a month for one or two articles a week. M. F. Sarcey has 250 francs for each of his weekly dramatic reviews in *Le Temps*.